THE

Healing Attempt

Examined and Submitted

TO THE

PARLIAMENT

AND

CONVOCATION,

Whether it be

HEALING or HURTFUL

To the Peace of the CHURCH.

JOB XXIV. 2.

Some remove the Land-marks, they violently take away the Flocks, and feed thereof.

Licensed and Entred according to Order.

LONDON:

Printed by *Freeman Collins*, and are to be Sold by *Richard Baldwin* in the *Old-Bailey*. MDCLXXXIX.

THE Healing Attempt EXAMINED, &c.

THE Author begins with his Bleſſing. And without Controverſie, a good Conceit therefore he ſeems to have of himſelf, who attempts to impoſe his Conceptions on the Judgment of thoſe Thirty Divines, to whom he preſents them, and to perſwade them to Aboliſh that Government and Liturgy, to which they have obliged themſelves to live in Obedience and Conformity by their Oaths and Subſcriptions. And immediately to his Bleſſing, he ſubjoyns what implies a Curſe, for loading and increaſing the Burthens of their Non-conforming Brethren, though he ſeems to excuſe it, as being done againſt their wills. And gives it, as the Belief of his Brethren, *That no good will be done them by that Meeting or Convocation*, ſeeing they ſay, *it is impoſſible that they*, &c. How this ſhould ſtimulate them to a greater earneſtneſs to do what they believe and have made impoſſible to be done, I cannot ſee; nor can the Author conceive, ſeeing he thinks it unneceſſary to propound any other Argument than what is contained in the Title (*i. e.*) Such a Moderation of Epiſcopacy, that the Power be kept within the line of our firſt Reformers, which will certainly deſtroy his Project, and confirm the preſent Eſtabliſhment, as to Epiſcopacy and Liturgy, from the ſtrict impoſition whereof he hopes to be freed. The Author complains of want of time and ſearch, to excuſe the ſlenderneſs of his Attempt: But if Mr. *Jo. Humphryes* be the Author, I ſuppoſe he hath had ſufficient time ſince his renouncing his re-ordination, which was about Twenty Years ſince; and that he had made his ſearch before, he with the help of other his Non-Con-Brethren, ſet forth their Reply to the Defence of Dr. *Stillingfleet*, wherein the chiefeſt of his preſent Arguments were then urged, and ſhortly after refuted, as by the following Account will hereafter appear.

He tells his Readers, *That it is impoſſible for the Diſſenters to Unite*, if it be ſtill affirmed, *That the Biſhop and Presbyters are not of the ſame Order, That the Power of Ordination is the ſole Prerogative of the Biſhops* (i.e.) *if the Presbyters may not Ordain as effectually as the Biſhops; That the Ordination by*

Presbyters only is void, That the Ordaining them again by Bishops is not re-ordination. This, saith our Author, destroys the Church-state, not only of the Dissenters, but of all other Protestants in the World; which is a very large stretch, seeing there are many other Protestant Churches, who affirm and practice the same things with the Church of *England*; and yet he asserts, *That if a comprehension may not be had but on these terms, there can be none at all.* However, seeing he makes his Appeal to the Sentiments of the first Reformers in the days of *Henry* VIII. *Edward* VI. and Queen *Elizabeth*, to them we will jointly submit, because he says, *that will heal our Divisions touching Church Government*; of which I doubt, seeing I have Reason to say, they are not impartially proposed by Mr. *J. H.* nor will be found to be so exactly the same with the Dissenters. So that if the present Episcopacy appear to be the same as it was in the days of the first Reformers, Martyrs, and Confessors, and our Liturgy much more Reformed, though they accounted it such a Grievance, as neither they nor their Fathers could bear.

Their Non Conformity will still lye under the interpretation of a peevish Humour and Obstinacy, though they do with the like Confidence pretend, that they have Antiquity as well as our first Reformers on their side; it is a condescention in the Author to acknowledge, that the Canons of *James* I. run another way, and to those Canons the Clergy did consent, as do the present Clergy; and if, as he says, Arch-Bishop *Usher* adhered to the first Reformers, we may yet hope for an Accommodation. As for the Opinions of particular Divines, I shall refer them to their due place, and only intimate his Observation to the Reader, That because Jurisdiction is given to the Dean and Chapter of *Canterbury*, during the Suspension of the Arch-Bishop, therefore they have also the Power of conferring Orders, when other Deans and Arch-Deacons also have an Episcopal Jurisdiction in their several peculiars, but neither of them have the Power of Orders; and *frustra est potentia quæ nunquam reducitur in actum.* And St. *Hierom* expresly appropriates Ordination to the Bishops only.

As to Mr. *Clerkson*'s Excellent Discourse of Liturgies, I shall recommend to the Reader's perusal, what hath been written by Bishop *Taylor*, Dr. *Hammond*, and Dr. *Faulkner*, to which I may add Mr. *Calvin*'s Epistle to the Protector, and leave it to the Reader's determination, whether a Liturgy of Extemporary Prayers are most agreeable to Publick Worship.

I agree with the Author in his Introduction, *That our Divisions had too great a hand in bringing us under those Dangers, and keeping us in those Fears which are still threatning us*; but that Indulgence and Comprehension together will secure us, I much doubt, because Experience hath taught the contrary; and therefore, though Mr. *J. H.* apprehends a necessity, for the saving of many thousand Souls, to let in Men of more tender Consciences (*Absit invidia*) to set open the Church-Doors wider, I think it may be a means to let in many Adversaries with a few Friends. I know the Complaints of Dissenters have been bold and clamourous ever since the Reign of

Queen

Queen *Elizabeth*; and great boasts made of their Numbers, and never louder than in the days of *Charles* the First of Blessed Memory, where the Martial Canons were planted to throw down the Ecclesiastical, and the Petitions of Dissenters worried that Good Prince and the Archbishop out of their Lives; and therefore I think our Governours, both in Church and State, had more just cause to complain of the Dissenters, than these of them; whereof you shall hear a fuller account from those whom the Author mentioneth, as Friends to his new Model. As to the Quotation from Sir *Robert Cotton*, I cannot much commend the ingenuity of Mr. *J. H.* who in the midst of it leaves out these words, (after these words) ---*Duty to their Sovereign:* It thus proceeds: *Therewith start up from among us some that might have been recommended for their Zeal, if it had been tempered with Discretion; who forerunning the Authority of the Magistrate, took upon them in sundry places, and publickly to censure what agreed not with their private conceits; with which gross humours, vented in Pulpits and Pamphlets, most Men grew to be frozen in Zeal*, &c. And the Marginal Note says, *Some think, that if these Mens zeal had by order been put to imploy it self otherwise, and a task set them to do some good and memorable thing in the Church, they might have been reformed or made harmless by diversion.* I desire Mr. *J. H.* to consider what it is, and of whom Sir *Robert* there speaketh, and to give a Reason why this was interpoled. And to this Quotation I shall subjoyn another of Mr. *R. B*'s in an Epistle to his separated Brethren, *That thousands are gone to Hell, and ten thousands going after them; who would never have gone thither, if they had kept in the Communion of their Parish-Churches.*

But in the conclusion of the Introduction, he seems no way satisfied with the Propension of our Governours to lay aside the strict use of Ceremonies, and other more offensive Impositions, unless this one thing may be granted; and, I think, such a grant will be still accounted a grievance, (*viz.*) a declaring the Government of the Church to be no other than what it was held and intended by the first Reformers; in the mean time he avers, That that Government which is really established by Law, is not only inconsistent with, and destructive of that which was setled in the Church by the first Reformers, but of the Church-state of all other Protestants. This *Durus Sermo.* This is his endeavour as to the Reign of *Henry* the Eighth in his first Chapter.

Here I think fit to advertise the Reader, that the Materials for the new Model of *Henry* the Eighth's Bishops, was fitted (though Mr. *J. H.* complains for want of time) above seven years since, and the Scheme drawn up by Mr. *H.* in's half Sheet, and offered to a Parliament; and because he took no notice of what was then said in Answer to his Model, in a Tract called, *No Protestant, but the Dissenters Plot*, Printed 1682. He deserves to do Pennance in a whole Sheet now; and because that Answer may be after so many years become forgotten, or rarely found; I beg the Reader's leave to repeat so much of it as concerns the State of our Church, and the Opinion of the Divines that then lived as to Episcopacy; because our Author

says

ſays the whole ſtreſs of his cauſe upon it; ſaying, *That this one thing is the moſt effectual expedient in the whole World, to promote his healing attempt*; wherein I ſhall joyn iſſue with him. It might be expected, that he ſhould have laid a ſure and ſolid Corner-ſtone for his new Model, becauſe an error in the foundation doth uſually run through the whole Fabrick; but this will appear to be nothing elſe but Slime and Sand; that is, in plain Engliſh, a confident Impoſture and Fiction of his own Brain; for, *p.* 9. the account which this Author gives of that excellent Book, *The Erudition of a Chriſtian Man*, is this, *That of theſe two Orders only*, (viz.) *Prieſts and Deacons, Scripture makes expreſs mention, and how they were conferred by the Apoſtles by Prayer and Impoſition of hands.* Thus ſaith Mr. *H. There are but two Orders only*, (i. e.) *Prieſts and Deacons, no third Order; Biſhops therefore muſt be of the ſame Order with Prieſts.* And again, *That all ſuch lawful Power and Authority of any one Biſhop*, Mr. *H.* adds, in a Parentheſis (or Prieſt, for they are in the ſenſe of theſe great Divines the ſame) *over another were, and be given them by the Conſent, Ordinance, and poſitive Laws of Men, and not by any Ordinance of God in Holy Scripture.* So far the neceſſary Erudition. Now that there may be a fair trial of this caſe, I ſhall ſet down from Dr. *Stillingfleet*'s printed Paper, the Opinions of thoſe Divines which conſulted about our Reformation in *Henry* the Eighth's days: concerning which I ſhall only mind the Diſſenters of an Obſervation of their own, *viz. That though ſome of theſe Reformers were of different Opinions as to ſome Points mentioned in this Manuſcript, yet they muſt be conſidered to have receded from them when they ſubſcribed the* Neceſſary Erudition, *being then all of that Judgment which is there deſcribed.*

The intent of Printing Dr. *Stillingfleet*'s Manuſcript, containing the Reſolutions of the Archbiſhop and ſeveral Biſhops and Divines of ſome Queſtions concerning the Sacraments, was, as Dr. *Burnet* ſays, that it might appear with what maturity and care they proceeded in the Reformation. And the Subſcriptions which were at the end of every mans Paper, he tells us, *p.* 242. were in this form: T. Cant. *This is my Opinion and Sentence; which I do not temeariouſly define, but do remit the Judgment thereof wholly to your Majeſty*—and as is alſo ſometimes expreſſed, *p.* 201. *without prejudice to the Truth, and ſaving always more better Judgment:* Cum facultate etiam melius deliberandi in hac parte. Now this Conſultation was ſome years before the Book was publiſhed; and if any of the Biſhops had been then of a contrary Opinion, as the *Diſſenters* obſerve that Archbiſhop *Cranmer* was in the caſe of Excommunication, inclining to *Eraſtianiſm*, from theſe they muſt be conſidered (ſay the *Diſſenters*) to have receded, becauſe they ſubſcribed the *Neceſſary Erudition*; p. 8. This Manuſcript ſpeaks home to our purpoſe in

Queſt. 9. *Whether the Apoſtles lacking a higher power, as in not having a a Chriſtian King among them, made Biſhops by that neceſſity, or by authority given by God?*

The

The Anſwer of the Archbiſhop to this Queſtion, as indeed to many others, is ſingular, and differs from the reſt of the Reformers; being, as the *Prefacers* themſelves do obſerve, meer *Eraſtianiſm*, p. 7. but from theſe alſo (as they ſay of his Opinion concerning Excommunication, *p.* 8.) he muſt be conſidered to have receded, becauſe he ſubſcribed the *Neceſſary Erudition*; which being done on more mature deliberation, we ought to impute nothing to the Archbiſhop as his judgment in thoſe controverted Points, but what is there by him aſſerted. I ſhall therefore mention the Reſolutions of the reſt only as we find them in the Re-collection; only of this firſt I ſhall ſpeak at large.

York. *We find in SS. that the Apoſtles uſed the power to make* Biſhops, Prieſts, *and* Deacons; *which power may be grounded upon theſe words:* Sicut miſit me vivens Pater, ſic ego mitto vos. *And we verily think that they durſt not have uſed ſo high a power, unleſs they had had authority from Chriſt. But that their power to ordain Biſhops, Prieſts, or Deacons by Impoſition of hands, requireth any other authority than authority of God, we neither read in SS. nor out of SS.*

London *I think the Apoſtles made Biſhops by the Law of God, becauſe* Acts 22. *it is ſaid,* In quo vos Spiritus Sanctus poſuit. *Nevertheleſs I think if Chriſtian Princes had been then, they ſhould have named by Right, and appointed the ſaid Biſhops to their places.*

Rocheſter. *I think that the Apoſtles made Biſhops by authority given them from God.*

Carliſle. *That Chriſt made his Apoſtles Prieſts and Biſhops, and that he gave them power to make others, it ſeemeth to be the very Trade of SS.*

Dr. Robertſon. *I think the Apoſtles made Biſhops and Presbyters by divine authority, where the publick Magiſtrate did permit it.*

Dr. Cox. *Although the Apoſtles had no authority to force any man to be Prieſts, yet (they moved by the Holy Ghoſt) had authority of God to exhort and induce men to ſet forth God's honour, and ſo to make them Prieſts.*

Dr. Day. *The Apoſtles ordained Biſhops by authority given them by God.* Joh. 20. Sicut miſit me, &c. Item Joh. ult. & Acts 20. & 1 Tim. 4. Paulus ordinavit Timotheum & Titum, & preſcribit quales ille debeant ordinare, 1 Tim. 1. Tit. 1.

Dr. Oglethorp. *The Apoſtles by authority and command of God, did ordain and inſtitute Biſhops, leave being deſired and obtained from the Prince or Magiſtrate who was then chief. As I ſuppoſe.*

Dr. Redman. *Chriſt gave his Apoſtles authority to make Biſhops and Miniſters in his Church, as he had received authority of the Father to make them Biſhops. But if any Chriſtian Prince had then been, the Apoſtles had been and ought to have been obedient Subjects, and would have attempted nothing but under the permiſſion and aſſent of their earthly Governours. Yet was it meet that they which were ſpecial and elect Servants of our Saviour Chriſt, and were ſent by him to convert the World, and having moſt abundantly the Holy Ghoſt in them, ſhould have ſpecial ordering of ſuch Miniſtry as pertained to the plant-*

ing

ing and increasing of the Faith: whereunto I doubt not but a Christian Prince of his godly mind would most lovingly have condescended. And it is to be considered in this Question, with other like, this word making *a Bishop or Priest, may be taken two ways: for understanding the word to* ordain *or* consecrate, *so it is a thing which pertaineth to the Apostles and their Successours only; but but if by this word* (making) *be understood the* appointing *or* naming *to the Office, so it pertaineth specially to the supreme Heads and Governours of the Church, which be Princes.*

Dr. Edgworth. *The Apostles made Bishops and Priests by authority given them of God, and not for lack of any higher power: notwithstanding, where there is a Christian King or Prince, the Election, Deputation, and Assignation of them that shall be Priests and Bishops, belongeth to the King or Prince, so that he may forbid any Bishop within his Kingdom that he give no Orders, for considerations moving him; and may assign him a time when he shall give Orders, and to whom: Example of King* David, 1 Chron. 24. *dividing the Levites into* twenty four Orders, *deputing over every Order one chief Bishop; prescribing an Ordinal and Rule how they should do their duties and courses; and what Sacrifices, Rites and Ceremonies they should use every day, as the day and time required. And his Son King* Solomon *diligently executed and commanded the same usages to be observed in the Temple, after he had erected and finished it,* 2 Chron. 8.

Dr. Symmons. *The Apostles made Bishops and Priests by authority given them of God.*

Dr. Tresham. *The Apostles had authority of God to make Bishops: yet if there had been a Christian King in any place where they made Bishops, they would and ought to have desired authority of him for the executing of such Godly acts; which no Christian King would have denied.*

Dr. Leighton. *The Apostles, as I suppose, made Bishops by authority given to them of Christ: howbeit I think they would and should have required the Christian Princes consent and license thereto, if there had been any Christian Kings or Princes.*

Dr. Coren. *The Apostles made Bishops and Priests by authority given them of God: Notwithstanding, if there had been a Christian King at that time, it had been their duties to have had his license and permission thereto.*

Here you see they all affirm that the Apostles, by authority from God, did make Bishops as well as Priests and Deacons; and that there needs no other authority for their Successours to do the like, but what is given them of God. Now that they were distinct Orders, will appear by the next Question.

Quest. 10. *Whether Bishops or Priests were first? and if the Priest were first, then the Priest made the Bishop?*

The Bishop of St. *Davids*, my Lord elect of *Westminster*, Dr. *Cox*, and Dr. *Redman* say, That *at the beginning they were all One.* The Bishops of *York*, *London*, *Rochester*, *Carlisle*, Doctors, *Day*, *Tresham*, *Symmons*, *Oglethorp*, be in *other contrary Opinions.* The Bishop of *York* and Dr. *Tresham* think

that

that *the Apoſtles firſt were Prieſts, and after were made Biſhops, when the overſeeing of other Prieſts was committed to them.* My Lords of *London, Dureſm, Carliſle,* and *Rocheſter,* Drs. *Symmonds* and *Grayford,* think that *the Apoſtles were firſt Biſhops, and they after made other Biſhops and Prieſts.* Drs. *Coren* and *Oglethorp* ſay, That *the Apoſtles were made Biſhops, and the ſeventy two were after made Prieſts.* Dr. *Day* thinks that *Biſhops, as they are now called, were before Prieſts.* My Lord of *London,* Drs. *Edgworth* and *Robertſon,* think it *no inconvenience if a Prieſt made a Biſhop in that time.*

Queſt. 11. *Whether a Biſhop hath Authority to make a Prieſt by the SS. or no? and whether any other but onely a Biſhop may make a Prieſt?*

To the former part of the Queſtion the Biſhop of St. *Davids* doth anſwer, That *Biſhops have no authority to make Prieſts, unleſs they be authorized of the Chriſtian Prince.* The others do all ſay, *That they be authorized of God.* Yet ſome of them add, *That they cannot uſe their Authority, without their Chriſtian Prince doth permit them.* To the ſecond part, the Anſwer of the Biſhop of St. *Davids is, That Lay-men have otherwhile made Prieſts.* So doth Drs. *Edgworth* and *Redman* ſay, *That* Moſes, *by a priviledge given him of God, made* Aaron *his Brother Prieſt.* Drs. *Treſham, Grayford,* and *Cox,* ſay, That *Lay-men may make Prieſts in time of neceſſity.* The Biſhops of *York, Dureſm, Rocheſter, Carliſle,* Elect of *Weſtminſter,* Drs. *Coren, Leighton, Symmonds,* ſeem to deny this thing: for they ſay, *They find not nor read not any ſuch Example.*

Queſt. 12. *Whether in the New Teſtament be required any Conſecration of a Piſhop and Prieſt, or onely appointing to the Office be ſufficient?*

The Biſhop of St. *Davids* ſaith, *That onely the appointing.* And Dr. *Cox,* That *onely the appointing* cum manuum impoſitione *is ſufficient, without Conſecration.* The Biſhops of *York, London, Dureſm, Carliſle,* Drs. *Day, Coren, Leighton, Treſham, Edgworth, Oglethorp,* ſay, *That Conſecration is requiſite.* Dr. *Redman* ſaith, *That Conſecration hath been from the Apoſtles time, and inſtituted of the Holy Ghoſt, to confer Grace.* My Lord of *Rocheſter,* Drs. *Day* and *Symmons* ſay, *The Prieſthood is given* per manuum impoſitionem, *and that by Scripture; and that Conſecration hath of long time been received in the Church.*

So that in this Paper, which contains a previous Conſultation (ſome years before) to the things publiſhed in the *Neceſſary Erudition,* they did generally agree, That the Office of Biſhops is mentioned in Scripture; That they were of a ſuperiour Order to Prieſts; That the Apoſtles made Biſhops by authority from God, and left their Succeſſours power to do the like. And to this they all ſubſcribed in the *Neceſſary Erudition.*

Much more might be added from ſome publick Writings of that Age, of which I ſhall name but one or two; as firſt, the Book called *Reformatio Legum Eccleſiaſticarum*; a deſign firſt begun by King *Henry* the Eighth, proſecuted by *Edward* the Sixth, as by their two Orders prefixed to that Book, doth appear; and committed to the care of thirty two *Divines* and *Civilians,* the Arch-Biſhop being the chief; wherein it is ordered, *That to the*

Biſhop all are to give Obedience according to the Word of God, p. 98. *Epiſcopo qui Eccleſiæ præficitur, non ſolum Decanus, Archidiaconus, Archipresbyter, & reliqui Miniſtri parebunt, &c.* And cap. 10. *Epiſcopi, quoniam inter cæteros Eccleſiæ Miniſtros, locum principem tenent, ideo ſana Doctrinâ gravi authoritate atque provido conſilio debent* inferiores Ordines Cleri *regere ac paſcere.* Dr. *Burnet*, p. 71. of the ſecond part, ſays, *It is plain that* Cranmer *had quite laid aſide thoſe ſingular Opinions which he formerly held of the Eccleſiaſtical Functions: for now in a Work of his own, without the concurrence of any other* (ſpeaking of his Catechiſm) *he fully ſets forth their Divine Inſtitution.*

And now I ſhall conſider how agreeable their Deſign is to the Ancient Conſtitution of our Government about matters Eccleſiaſtical, which (as they ſay) is very excellently deſcribed in (the Book called) *The neceſſary Doctrine and Erudition of a Chriſtian-man, compoſed by ſeveral Biſhops and other great Doctors, and approved by Authority in the days of King* Henry *the Eighth.* The *Diſſenters* cannot have a greater Reverence for that Book than the *Conformiſts* have, as to the Conſtitution of our Church. And to corroborate this Authority, they add that of another excellent Book (*viz.*) *Dr.* Burnet's *Hiſtory of the Reformation*; for which, as they obſerve, *the whole Kingdom have given the Doctor thanks*: And I ſhall think the worſe of theſe *Diſſenters*, if they will not do the ſame. P. 16. From theſe Books they attempt to prove, that *the eſtabliſhing a Parochial or Congregational Church-Diſcipline* (the great thing which the *Diſſenters* deſire) *may be done conſiſtently with the Ancient Conſtitution of the Government of this Realm, to the fixing the deſired, firm, and laſting Union.* P. 11. If this appear, the *Diſſenters* may well boaſt that they are the Genuine Sons of the Church of *England*, as it was ſetled by the firſt Reformers; and that they have been (as they complain) *miſrepreſented as Enemies both to Church and State; as if the adhering to old Proteſtant Principles about Church-Diſcipline had been the* Overt Act *of a Spirit ſeditious and phanatical*, p. 17. To theſe two they have appealed for the truth of their Aſſertion; and I hope they will not ſhew themſelves ſuch double-minded men, as to be *unſtable in all their ways*, and not ſtand to the Evidence and Arbitration of theſe two Authorities produced by themſelves. And if the reducing of us to the Ancient Conſtitution of Church-Government and Diſcipline in this Realm, may fix the deſired, firm, and laſting Union, it will be ſtill the *Diſſenters* fault that we are not all agreed.

In that Judicious Tract 'tis manifeſt (ſay the *Diſſenters*, p. 2.)

1. *That Church-Government is* Jure Divino. Be it ſo.

2. *That to the conſtituting ſuch a Church-Government, thoſe Church-Officers onely are neceſſary who are mentioned in the New Teſtament.* This is alſo granted.

3. *That in the New Teſtament there is mention made of no other Church-Officers but Prieſts and Deacons.* This is *ſub judice.*

4. *That*

4. *That Biſhops or Prieſts, the ſole Governours of the Church, are of one and the ſame Order.* This alſo is to be determined.

To all this I ſhall oppoſe a ſhort Syllogiſm, *viz.*

That Church-Government which is mentioned in the New Teſtament (by the Compilers of the *Neceſſary Erudition*) is *Jure Divino.*

But the Church Government mentioned, *&c.* is by Biſhops, Prieſts, and Deacons.

Ergo, the Church-Government by Biſhops, Prieſts, and Deacons, is *Jure Divino*, according to the *Neceſſary Erudition.*

It chanced that on reading this Preface, I had at hand that ancient Book, printed in *Engliſh* 1543. and ſet forth by the King's Authority, as appears by the Preface. I had alſo a Tranſlation of the ſame Book into elegant Latine, printed the following year, *viz.* 1544. This Latine Book hath a Preface more than I find in the Engliſh, which ſeems to be compiled by the Arch-Biſhop and the reſt of the Reforming Clergy, who give us this reaſon of the tranſlating it into Latine: *Quam Inſtitutionem (Lector Cariſſime) Illuſtriſſimi ſimul & Religioſiſſimi Principis induſtriâ primum vernaculo ſermone editam, nos nunc in Latinum verſam in lucem damus; Quod indignum duximus ut hoc pacificandæ Eccleſiæ ſtudium, & exemplum quo Regia Majeſtas immortalem ſibi gloriam promerita eſt in obſcuro lateret, ac non potius orbi univerſo, quo cæteri Principes ad ſimilem componendæ Religionis zelum excitentur innoteſceret:* (*i. e.*) Which Erudition firſt publiſhed in Engliſh by the Induſtry of our moſt Illuſtrious and Religious Prince, we now publiſh in Latine; as thinking it an unworthy thing, that the care and good Example of pacifying the Church, whereby His Majeſty hath deſerved immortal Glory, ſhould lie hid, and not be known to the World, to ſtir up other Princes to the like Zeal.

From whence I deſire the Reader to obſerve, that this Book being ſet forth a year after the Engliſh one, and being ſomewhat explained and inlarged, as intended to inform the Foreign Churches with the matter and order of our Reformation, is of the two the more exact and perfect, as containing their ſecond Thoughts and final Reſolutions. The place quoted out of that Book, is that which concerns *The Sacrament of Orders; which* (ſay they) *are given of God to Chriſtian men by the Conſecration and Impoſition of the Biſhops hands.* And doubtleſs King *Henry* would have been very much in wrath with any that ſhould have denied the Order of Biſhops to be Sacramental, when by their hands, and by a *power given them of God*, as is their aſſerted, other Orders were to be conveyed.

But ſecondly, I obſerve, that whereas that Book nameth Biſhops *And* Prieſts as two diſtinct Orders, theſe *Diſſenters*, by a little trick (learnt of the Jeſuits) of changing a ſmall ſyllable, would alter the ſenſe of the whole Chapter: for four or five times in the ſecond and third pages, the *Diſſenters* name *Biſhops Or Prieſts*, making them one and the ſame thing; which the Reformers in that Chapter of Orders do diſtinguiſh as two diſtinct Or-

ders; and eight times at leaſt read *Biſhops And (not Or) Prieſts* in ſenſu diviſo. In the firſt place it is ſaid, that *St.* Paul *did conſecrate and order Prieſts and Biſhops*; for which they quote 1 *Tim.* 4. (*i. e.*) Jure Divino. And again, as the *Apoſtles themſelves did order Prieſts and Biſhops*, ſo they *appointed and willed other Biſhops after them to do the like*; for which they quote *Titus* 1. and 1 *Tim.* 5. which is another Proof out of the New Teſtament. In another place they ſay, that *the Prieſts and Biſhops in the execution of their Office and Miniſtration, do uſe and exerciſe the power and authority of God committed unto them.* And to name but one place more (for I ſhall quote thoſe onely which in the ſenſe of thoſe Reformers (and our Diſſenters too) prove the Order of Biſhops to be diſtinct from that of Prieſts, and of Divine Inſtitution) ſpeaking of the power of the Prince over Biſhops and Prieſts, they ſay, that *the Prince is to overſee and cauſe the ſaid Biſhops and Prieſts to execute their Paſtoral Office truly and faithfully, and ſpecially in thoſe points which by Chriſt and his Apoſtles were given and committed to them.* So that it is undeniable that Biſhops are mentioned as Church-Officers in the New Teſtament by this excellent Book, and conſequently are neceſſary to ſuch a Church-Government as is *Jure Divino*, according to the firſt and ſecond Aſſertion of the Diſſenters.

Let us inquire therefore how they derive their third Aſſertion from this Book; which is, That *in the New Teſtament there is mention made of no other Church-Officers but Prieſts and Deacons.* (To which words they immediately add) That *no other Government is of Divine Right, but what is under the conduct of Biſhops or Prieſts*, and that *the New Teſtament mentioneth no other*: Which grants that *Biſhops* are mentioned in the New Teſtament as well as *Prieſts*. But the *Diſſenters* will not grant them to be mentioned in the ſenſe of the Reformers (that is) as a diſtinct Office, and having a Superiority over Prieſts and Deacons: for in the

Fourth Aſſertion they ſay, *That Biſhops or Prieſts, the ſole Governours of the Church, are of one and the ſame Order.* For proof whereof, they quote theſe words out of the *Neceſſary Erudition*, (viz.) *That Biſhops, or Prieſts and Deacons, are the onely Orders mentioned in the New Teſtament*—— And that *of theſe two Orders onely*, (i. e.) *Prieſts and Deacons, Scripture maketh expreſs mention.* To which I anſwer, That it is no-where ſaid in the *Neceſſary Erudition*, That *Biſhops or Prieſts, the ſole Governours of the Church, are of one and the ſame Order*: And that this Aſſertion is contradicted by the following Quotation upon which they ground it, (*viz.*) *That Biſhops, or Prieſts and Deacons are the onely Orders mentioned in the New Teſtament.* For throughout that whole Chapter, the Reformers make as plain a diſtinction betwen *Biſhops* and *Prieſts*, as between *Prieſts* and *Deacons*.

I do therefore reject the firſt Aſſertion as a Fiction of their own, not to be found in the *Neceſſary Erudition*, nor in the practice of the Authors of it, which could beſt expound their meaning, viz. *That Biſhops or Prieſts are of one and the ſame Order.*

As

As to the ſecond, *viz.* That *of theſe two Orders onely* (i. e.) *of Prieſts and Deacons, the Scripture maketh mention*; I hope to give ſuch a plain and genuine ſenſe of the Authors, as our *Diſſenters* (notwithſtanding all their Prejudices and Evaſions) ſhall not be able to deny. And (becauſe, *Qui benè diſtinguit, benè docet*) I deſire them to obſerve this diſtinction of the word *Order*, which ſignifieth either the Power and Faculty conferred by the Apoſtles hands; or the *Modus*, the Rite and Ceremony of Impoſition of Hands and Prayer, by which it was conferred. The firſt is properly *Order*, and the ſecond, as they term it, *Ordering* or *Ordination*. Now I will not diſpute in which ſenſe our Reformers uſe the word *Order* in this place; the Context will ſhew that: But let the *Diſſenters* take it in which ſenſe they will, it will be ſo far from eſtabliſhing, that it will overthrow their Propoſitions, That *Biſhops and Prieſts are one and the ſame Order; and that of theſe two onely Scripture maketh expreſs mention.*

I grant therefore, that this ſecond ſentence is found intire in that Book, (viz.) *Of theſe two Orders onely*, (i. e.) *Prieſts and Deacons, Scripture maketh expreſs mention.* But had theſe men been ſo ingenuous as to quote the whole Paragraph, or to judge of the ſenſe of this Expreſſion, which is ſomewhat dark, by thoſe which were more plain, whereof ſome go before, and others follow that ſentence, and all declare Biſhops to be a diſtinct Order, and to be mentioned in the New Teſtament; they would never have had the confidence ſo to expoſe theſe learned Reformers, as if they had contradicted themſelves in the ſame breath, and profeſſed their Judgment to be contrary to their Practice, in a Book of that importance, written with great Advice and Deliberation, and publiſhed to give the World an account of the Reformation. Could their Popiſh Adverſaries of that Age have fixed ſuch an Opinion and Contradiction on them, they ſhould have heard of it as loudly as we have of the *Nags head Fable*: but they had not the confidence to feign them guilty of that Opinion which theſe *Diſſenters* would force on them whether they will or no. For the Papiſts of that Age knew that *Lex currit cum praxi*, and that the Reformers exerciſing Epiſcopal Authority over the Presbyters within their ſeveral Dioceſſes, was a clear proof that they judged their Order to be ſuperiour to that of Prieſts, and that by Divine Inſtitution (as in the four places above-mentioned doth appear.)

But to clear this Objection, I ſhall firſt examine the place quoted as it is entire. Secondly, I ſhall ſhew the ſenſe of it from the Latine Tranſlation, which is the beſt Commentary. And thirdly, from the received Opinion of other Divines of that Age. And fourthly, I ſhall give you Dr. *Burnet's* Opinion of the whole matter.

Firſt, The place quoted ſays thus: *Of theſe two Orders onely* (i. e.) *Prieſts and Deacons, Scripture maketh expreſs mention, and how they were conferred of the Apoſtles by Prayer and Impoſition of their Hands: and to theſe two the Primitive Church did add and conjoyn certain* other *inferiour and lower degrees, as Subdeacons, Acolytes, Exorciſts, with divers other, of the which mention is made both of the moſt Ancient Writers that we have in the Church of Chriſt after*

after the Apoſtles; as alſo in divers old Councils, and namely, in the fourth Council of Africk, *in which St.* Auguſtine *was preſent; where all the kinds of Orders which were then in the Church be rehearſed.* Now though what hath been obſerved from the Context, might be enough to ſatisfie all Perſons that were not maliciouſly diſpoſed to quarrel with thoſe Reformers, as if they contradicted themſelves, and overthrew that Epiſcopal Order *in Theſi*, which they maintained *in Praxi*; yet this Paragraph is ſo clear by its own light, that they muſt needs wink with both eyes that could not ſee the ſenſe of the Reformers in it.

Firſt then, the ſcope of the Paragraph ought to have been conſidered, which is to ſpeak of ſuch Orders as were *inferiour to the Apoſtles and Biſhops in Scripture-times*; of which they ſay that *expreſs mention is made in Scripture onely of theſe two, (*i. e.*) Prieſts and Deacons*: To which two, though the Church added *other inferiour and lower degrees* mentioned in Ancient Writers (yet there is no mention of them in the Scripture, but) in ſome old Councils, and namely, in the four *African*, where all the kinds of Orders be rehearſed. Now in that Council you may find the ſeveral Rites of Ordaining. 1. Biſhops, 2. Presbyters, 3. Deacons, 4. Subdeacons, 5. Acolythi, 6. Exorciſts, *&c.* And Canon 27. *Ut Epiſcopus de loco ignobile ad nobilem non tranſeat, nec quiſquam inferioris ordinis Clericus: Inferioris vero gradus Sacerdotes poſſunt conceſſione ſuorum Epiſcoporum ad alias* Eccleſias *migrare.* So that in the Judgment of that Council, Prieſts were an inferiour Order to Biſhops; and conſequently they were ſo in the Judgment of our Reformers, who quote it to that end. See *Binius*, Tom. 1. p. 728.

This alſo appears from the *Milevitan* Council, which is alſo quoted by the Reformers, in which St. *Auguſtine* was alſo preſent; wherein a Canon was made, *Quo prohibiter ne Presbyteri, Diaconi, vel cæteri* inferiores Clerici *in cauſis ſuis ulla extra Africam adeant judicia.* So that by both theſe Councils, *Prieſts* as well as *Deacons* are proved to be *inferiour* to *Biſhops*: which was the thing intended by our Reformers in that Paragraph.

So that when theſe *Diſſenters* (from this paſſage, (*viz.*) that of *theſe two Orders onely,* (i. e.) *Prieſts and Deacons, Scripture maketh expreſs mention*) do in the words immediately following infer, That *all others* (meaning particularly that of *Biſhops*) were afterward added by the Church, *p.* 2. and name this inference as if it were the very words of that excellent Book, is no leſs a ſin, than the bearing falſe witneſs againſt them; for they treat onely of other inferiour and lower degrees. So that if the word *Order* be taken in the firſt ſenſe, for the power or faculty of adminiſtring holy things conferred by the Biſhops, it is their plain ſenſe, That *the Scripture maketh expreſs mention of theſe two inferiour Orders onely,* (i. e.) *Prieſts and Deacons*, and not of Subdeacons, Acolytes, *&c.*

Moreover, two things eſpecially ſeem deſigned by the Reformers concerning the *Sacrament of Orders*: The firſt is to ſhew that Biſhops are of Divine Inſtitution, and had not their dependance on the Pope, whom his Favourites made the only Biſhop, and all the reſt deriving their power and autho-

authority from him. The ſecond was to ſhew, that of all thoſe *ſeven Orders* which were made *Sacramental*, onely thoſe of *Biſhops*, *Prieſts*, and *Deacons* had foundation in Scripture; the reſt were added in after-times. And to confirm both theſe, they deſcribe the manner of ordaining both Biſhops, Prieſts, and Deacons in the Holy Scripture, to diſcharge it from thoſe ſuperſtitious Ceremonies introduced by the Pope, and made neceſſary to their Ordination. As for the *Superiority* of Biſhops to Prieſts, there is no queſtion made, much leſs of their *Identity* or *ſameneſs* of Office.

For the Divine Right of Biſhops, they aſſert it in four ſeveral places, that they have it from Chriſt; and prove it by Scripture, and from thence infer this Concluſion, That whereas the Biſhop of *Rome* hath heretofore claimed and uſurped to be Head and Governour of all Biſhops and Prieſts of the Catholick Church, by the Laws of God; it is evident that his Power is utterly feigned and untrue, and was neither given him by God in Holy Scripture, nor allowed by the Fathers in Ancient General Councils, nor by conſent of the Cotholick Church. And they declare, That the Authorities, Powers, and Juriſdictions of Patriarchs, Primates, Arch-biſhops, and Metropolitans, were given them by the poſitive Laws of men onely, and not by any Ordinance of God in Holy Scripture. And the power uſurped by any one Biſhop over another, (not given him by the Conſent of men) is no lawful Power, but plain Uſurpation and Tyranny: Which they prove from the Ancient Councils and Fathers againſt the Pope. Secondly, They ſhew, that of thoſe *ſeven Orders* owned by the Church of *Rome* as *Sacramental*, onely Biſhops, Prieſts, and Deacons, had their Inſtitution in the Holy Scripture; and that Subdeacons, Acolytes, Exorciſts, *&c.* were added by the Church, as alſo the Rites and Ceremonies by which they were conferred. And thirdly, to confirm what they had ſaid, they deſcribe the manner of ordaining Biſhops, Prieſts, and Deacons, to clear it from thoſe ſuperſtitious Ceremonies brought in by the Church of *Rome*; as the Ring and Croſier-ſtaff, ſeveral Unctions and Garments, ſome of which muſt come from *Rome*; whereas the Scripture mentions onely the impoſition of Hands and Prayers. In theſe words, *Of theſe two Orders onely*, (i. e.) *Prieſts and Deacons, the Scripture maketh expreſs mention*; and how *they were conferred of the Apoſtles by Prayer and impoſition of their Hands.* And evident it is to me, that by the word *Orders* they intended onely the manner of Ordaining, not the diſtinction of Orders: for they all held the Superiority of Biſhops to Prieſts. And this will appear, firſt, from the word uſed by the Latine Tranſlation, which is, *De his tantum Ordinationibus*, of theſe Ordinations onely, not of theſe two Orders onely, the Scripture makes mention, and deſcribeth the manner of conferring them. And doubtleſs thoſe learned men did not confound the words *Ordo* and *Ordinatio*. For the underſtanding whereof, I ſhall explain the Engliſh Edition by the Latine.

Thus in the beginning they ſay, That *theſe Orders were given by the Conſecration and Impoſition of the Biſhops hands*: [*Per Conſecrationem & Impoſitionem manum Epiſcopi.*] And as the Apoſtles themſelves in the beginning

of

of the Church did order Priests and Bishops; so they willed the other Bishops to the like. Thus the Latine Book: *Et* Quemadmodum *Apostoli ipsi Episcopos & Presbyteros* Ordinaverunt, ita, *eosdem etiam instituisse ut in posterum succedentes Episcopi* eundem ordinandi morem *in Ecclesia servarent.* Again, *Here is to be noted, That although this Form before declared is to be observed in giving Orders,* &c. in the Latine, *Quanquam autem* hunc in modum *Scriptura Ordinationes fieri instituit.* Again, *Thus we have briefly touched the Ordering, not the Orders of Priests and Bishops.* The Latine, *Hactenus quidem* de Ordinatione *Presbyterorum.* Neither speak of the *Order*, but *Ordering.* Moreover, touching the Order of Deacons, we read *Acts* 6. that they were ordered and instituted by the same Apostles by Prayer and Imposition of their hands. The Latine, *Jam vero præter* Episcopos & Sacerdotes, Diaconorum etiam Scriptura meminit, *traditque hos ab Apostolis per Orationem & manuum impositionem ordinatos & institutos fuisse.* After all which it followeth, *Of these two Orders onely,* (which I cannot understand (the premises being considered) in any other sense than as the Latine renders it) Of these *Ordinations* onely, and how they were conferred, the Scripture maketh mention, That they were conferred by Prayer and Imposition of hands. Nor can it be thought that by the mentioning the *manner of ordaining* Bishops and Priests to be the same, that therefore the Reformers thought the *Order* to be the same; because the Deacons were ordained in the same manner, and yet it is granted that they were distinct Orders And for the distinction of the Orders of Priests and Bishops, enough had been spoken before, and their present practice did demonstrate what their Opinions were.

If any desire farther satisfaction in these things, let him read the Casuists *de Sacramento Ordinis*, where this distinction is obvious: *Ordo significat vel ipsam potestatem, vel Ordinationem quâ potestas datur.* And they may find that *Bellarmine*, and generally the *Jesuits*, reckon Bishops and Priests to be but one Order, as our *Dissenters* would have it: and among the later Schoolmen it was made a Question, *An Episcopatus sit Ordo à Presbyteratu distinctus*; and they generally hold that they are one in *Genere Sacerdotis*, but are distinct in *Specie*, the Episcopal Character including that of a Priest; and so they hold that *Solum Sacerdotium est Ordo & Sacramentum.* So they dispute against the Imposition of hands in Ordination of Priests; and the usual form was by delivering the Patine and Chalice, with Bread and Wine, with these words: *Accipe potestatem offerendi Sacrificia pro vivis & mortuis, In nomine Patris, &c.* And they affirm, That the Pope can create a Bishop or Priest, onely by saying, *Be thou a Bishop or Priest*—— A Deacon is ordained by delivering of the Gospels into his hands, and the Subdeacon by delivery of an empty Patine and Chalice: Which superstitious uses our Reformers would destroy, and reduce to the Apostolical Practice.

One Argument more these *Dissenters* mention from the *Necessary Erudition*, as good as the rest, p. 3. *The Order of a Bishop or Priest is one and the same, whose Office is not onely to preach and administer Sacraments, but moreover to exercise*

exerciſe Diſcipline, namely, in abſoyling and looſing from ſin ſuch as be truly penitent, and in excommunicating the obſtinately vicious; where from the Community of ſome Offices, they would argue to the equality of the Orders: though nothing is more evident, than that the Biſhops of this Age reſerved the power of *Confirmation, Ordination*, and *Dioceſan Juriſdiction* to themſelves, as their Right *Jure Divino*, as will yet further appear. But no-where doth the *Neceſſary Erudition* ſay, That the Order of a Biſhop or Prieſt is one and the ſame, as they ſophiſtically infer: And they may as well affirm it to be the ſence of the Council of *Trent*, as of our Reformers, who uſe almoſt the ſame words, *Non ſolum Sacerdotibus, ſed & de Diaconis, Sacræ Literæ apertam mentionem faciunt.*

I cannot conceive what ground theſe *Diſſenters* had to fix this Errour of theirs upon, unleſs an unwary Expreſſion of Dr. *Burnet*'s; who perhaps conſidering the Arch-biſhop's Judgment, more than the Judgments of the reſt, doth aſſert the ſame as the *Diſſenters* do: But if they had it from him, they had alſo in him a correction of this Error; and it was far from the ingenuity of true Proteſtant Divines, to publiſh the Error, and conceal the Confutation of it. Thus then Dr. *Burnet* diſcovers the whole Intrigue, Dr. *Burnet*, p. 336. of the firſt part, *That both in this Writing* (*i.e.* Dr. *Stillingfleet*'s Manuſcript) and in the *Neceſſary Erudition of a Chriſtian man, Biſhops and Prieſts are ſpoken of as one and the ſame Office.* But Dr. *Burnet* adds, *In the ancient Church they knew none of thoſe ſubti'ties which were found out in the later Ages; it was then thought enough that a Biſhop was to be dedicated to his Function by a new Impoſition of hands, and that ſeveral Offices could not be performed without a Biſhop, ſuch as Ordination, Confirmation*, &c. *But they did not refine in theſe matters ſo much as to enquire whether Biſhops and Prieſts differed in Order and Office, or only in degree: But after the School-men fell to examine matters of Dignity with logical and unintelligible Niceties, the Canoniſts began to comment upon the Rules of the Ancient Church, they ſtudied to make Biſhops and Prieſts ſeem very near one to another, ſo that the difference was but ſmall. They did it with different deſigns: The School-men having ſet up the grand Myſtery of Tranſubſtantiation, were to exalt the Prieſtly Office as much as was poſſible; for the turning of the Hoſt into God, was ſo great an action, that they reckoned there could be no Office higher than that which qualified a man to ſo mighty a performance. Therefore as they changed the form of Ordination from what it was anciently believed to conſiſt in*, (viz.) *Impoſition of hands, to a delivering of Sacred Veſſels; and held that a Prieſt had his Orders by that Rite, not by the Impoſition of hands: So they raiſed their Order or Office ſo high, as to make it equal with the Order of a Biſhop. But as they deſigned to extol the Order of Prieſthood, ſo the Canoniſts had as great a mind to depreſs the Epiſcopal Order; they generally wrote for preferment, and the way to it, was to extol the Papacy: Nothing could do that ſo effectually, as to bring down the power of Biſhops; this only could juſtifie the Exemptions of the Monks and Friars, the Popes ſetting up Legantine Courts, and receiving at firſt Appeals, and then Original Cauſes before them, together with many other Encroachments on the*

Juriſdiction of Biſhops; all which were unlawful, if the Biſhops had by Divine Right Juriſdiction in their Dioceſſes: Therefore it was neceſſary to lay them as low as could be, and to make them think that the power they held was rather as delegates of the Apoſtolick See, than by a Commiſſion from Chriſt or his Apoſtles. So that they looked on the declaring Epiſcopal Authority to be of Divine Right, as a blow that would be fatal to the Court of Rome; *therefore they did after this at* Trent, *uſe all poſſible endeavours to hinder any ſuch Deciſion: it having been then the common Stile of that Age, to reckon Biſhops and Prieſts as the ſame Office, it is no wonder if at this time the Clergy of this Church, the greateſt part of them being ſtill leavened with the old Superſtition, and the reſt of them not having enough of ſpare time to examine leſſer matters, retain ſtill the former Phraſes in this particular.*

This might have been ſufficient to correct the forwardneſs of our *Diſſenters* to comply with the Papiſts in this new Notion of Biſhops or Prieſts as one Order; but becauſe they abated nothing of their confidence by this, I ſhall mind them of that ſeverer Reprimand of the Doctor's, for which in their behalf I give him hearty thanks, for I think he ſhall have none from them. It is in theſe words (N. B.)

On this I have inſiſted the more, that it may appear how little they have conſidered things, who are ſo far carried with their Zeal againſt the eſtabliſhed Government of this Church, as to make much uſe of ſome paſſages of the Schoolmen and Canoniſts that deny them to be diſtinct Orders: for theſe are the very dregs of Popery (N. B.) the one raiſing the Prieſts higher for the ſake of Tranſubſtantiation, *the other pulling the Biſhops lower for the ſake of the* Popes Supremacy, *and by ſuch means bringing them almoſt to an equality. So partial are ſome men to their particular Conceits, that they make uſe of the moſt miſchievous Topicks when they can ſerve their turn, not conſidering how much farther theſe Arguments will run if they ever admit them.*

So that although the Phraſe of *Prieſts* or *Biſhops* might have been uſed in former times, as it was in a Paper printed among the *Addenda* to the firſt part of the Doctor's Hiſtory, *p.* 324. which Paper was written about ſix years before the *Neceſſary Erudition*, as is proved, *p.* 365. of the firſt part: Yet when our *Diſſenters* read (as no doubt they did) theſe Remarks of the Doctor's concerning the riſe and miſchievous tendences of it, their preſumption in urging it from that Paper where it is ſo ſhamefully condemned, is as unpardonable as their endeavour to faſten it on the *Neceſſary Erudition*, where the contrary is evidently aſſerted.

And is this the great Reverence that our *Diſſenters* have for the firſt Reformers, thus to wreſt and abuſe their Writings, by altering their Words, curtailing their Sentences, and repreſenting them as contradicting themſelves, as well as the Univerſal Church in all Ages before them, in ſuch an excellent Book, and to object that againſt them, which their Adverſaries, who watched for ſuch an advantage, could never find? This is no otherwiſe to honour them, than to call them to a ſecond Martyrdom, more inglorious and hateful to them than the firſt. And yet theſe *Diſſenters* could not but know,

know, that all they who had a hand in compiling that Book, were either Dioceſan Biſhops, or ſuch Divines as lived in a willing ſubmiſſion to them. And theſe things are ſufficient to ſhew, that the *Diſſenters* are more genuine Sons of ſome other Church, than of the Church of *England* according to its Primitive Conſtitution.

And thus the Declaration mentioned by our Author to be ſubſcribed by *Tho. Cromwell*, &c. which ſays, *That in the New Teſtament there is no mention made of any degrees or diſtinctions in Orders, but only of Deacons or Miniſters, Prieſts or Biſhops*; as alſo the Opinions of *Tindal*, *Lambert*, and Dr. *Barnes*, muſt be ſubmitted to the more mature and authorized Judgment of the State, Civil and Eccleſiaſtical, expreſſed in the *Neceſſary Erudition*. And the private Sentiments of ſuch Divines as have written from the days of *Edward* VI. until now, muſt be adjudged to be conformable to the Judgment and Determination of the Church, which hath been eſtabliſhed by Law in their days, to which alſo they generally ſubſcribed; and then I need ſay no more, but that the Forms of Ordaining and Conſecrating Biſhops, Prieſts, and Deacons, will determine the Queſtion; whether from the beginning of our Reformation, the Church of *England* hath acknowledged three Orders, *viz.* of Biſhops, Prieſts, and Deacons, or two only; And whether the Church-Government eſtabliſhed by Law ever ſince the days of *Edward* VI. hath not been by Dioceſan Biſhops.

But I would ask theſe men, Could they have conformed to *Epiſcopacy* and *Liturgy* under King *Henry* the Eighth, or *Edward* the Sixth, and can they not now? Was not *Epiſcopacy* the ſame then as it is now; and the *Liturgie* much better now than it was then? Could you conform to *Henry* the Eighth's *Primer*, to his *ſix Articles* and *ſeven Sacraments*? Or to the *Liturgie* eſtabliſhed by King *Edward* the Sixth, wherein were many things that were deſervedly accounted *Inepeias*? As in the *Communion-Office*, where they commend to the mercy of God *all his Servants departed hence from us*; And that God would *command our Prayers and Supplications by the miniſtry of his holy Angels to be brought up into his holy Tabernacle*: The commending *Auricular* and *Secret Confeſſion* to the Prieſt: And in the Office of *Baptiſm*, enjoyning a great part of that Office to be performed *the people ſtanding at the Church-door*; and then to *take the Child by the right hand, and lead it towards the Font*: To *ſign it with the ſign of the Croſs on the Breaſt*, as well as the *Forehead*. The uſe of *Exorciſm*, in theſe words: *I command thee, thou unclean Spirit, in the Name of the Father*, &c. *to come out and depart from this Infant. The dipping the Child three times in the Water, (except in caſe of weakneſs) firſt on the right ſide, then on the left, and then with the Face towards the Water*. Then to put on it the *Cryſom*, ſaying, *Take thou this white Veſture for a Token of the Innocency*, &c. Then to *anoint the Infant on the head, praying God to anoint him with the Unction of the Spirit*. And (to omit many other things) *anointing the ſick, and ſigning his breaſt with the ſign of the Croſs*. Commending at the time of Burial *into the hands of God's mercy the Souls of the departed*.

As for the Book of *conſecrating Biſhops, Prieſts, and Deacons*, it was added to the *Liturgie* by King *Edward*, as it is received now, with ſome few alterations (mentioned by Dr. *Burnet*) for the better, *p.* 144.

His *Articles*, and *Acts for Uniformity*, were as ſevere as any that are now. And all theſe were eſtabliſhed in Arch-biſhop *Cranmer*'s time, and with his good Approbation.

In the Articles of Religion, printed 1552. one concerning the Liturgy declares thus. *The Book* (of Prayers) *which of very late time was given to the Church of* England *by the Authority of Parliament, containing the Manner and Form of praying, and miniſtring the Sacraments; and the Book of ordering Miniſters of the Church, ſet forth by the afore ſaid Authority, are godly, and in no point repugnant to the wholſome Doctrine of the Goſpel, but agreeing thereunto, furthering and beautifying the ſame not a little; and therefore of all faithful Miniſters of the Church of* England, *and chiefly of the Miniſters of the Lord, ought to be received and allowed with all readineſs of mind and thanksgiving, and to be commended to the people of God.* Beſides the Diſcourſe *concerning Ceremonies retained* in our Book, was then ſet forth; as alſo a *Proclamation* againſt thoſe that *innovate, alter, or leave down any Rite or Ceremony in the Church, and that preach without Licenſe*; printed in the ſecond year of *Edward* the Sixth, (to which the Form for *Bidding of Prayers* may be added.) See *p.* 128. of Dr. *Burnet*'s ſecond part. All which notwithſtanding, *Bucer* and *Peter Martyr* approved of Conformity.

And Mr. *Calvin* himſelf both perſwaded and approved all that was done in the ſecond Liturgy of King *Edward*, in an Epiſtle of his to the then *Protector*, being the forty firſt Epiſtle in the Edition at *Amſterdam*, 1667. to this effect: "Let there be publiſhed a Summary of Doctrine to be received "by all, which all may conform to in their preaching; for the obſervance "of which, let all Biſhops and Pariſh-Prieſts be obliged by Oath; and let "none be admitted to Eccleſiaſtical Function, unleſs he promiſe to obſerve "that conſent of Doctrine inviolate. Let there be alſo a common form of "Catechiſm for the uſe of Children: I alſo greatly approve that there be a "certain Form of Prayers and Eccleſiaſtical Rites, from which it ſhould not "be lawful for the Paſtors to recede in their Function; as well to provide "for the ſimplicity and unskilfulneſs of ſome, as alſo that thereby the con-"ſent of all the Churches may more certainly appear; and laſtly, that the "deſultory levity of ſome men, who affect Novelties, may be prevented. "So that there ought to be an eſtabliſhed Catechiſm, an eſtabliſhed Admini-"ſtration of the Sacraments, and publick Form of Prayers.

Did not Dr. *Taylor*, a learned Martyr, declare of the Liturgy as it ſtood in *Edward* the Sixth's days, that according to the Rules of our Chriſtian Religion in every behalf, *no Chriſtian Conſcience could be offended with any thing therein contained*? And is it well done to fill the Conſciences of the People now with Scruples againſt almoſt every part of it? How theſe men would have demeaned themſelves under the Impoſitions and Biſhops in the days of *Henry* the Eighth, and *Edward* the Sixth, I cannot divine, Uniformity being

as

as ſtrictly enjoyned then, as it is now. For ſuch as did *officiate in any other manner than was preſcribed by the Liturgie, were for the firſt Offence to ſuffer ſix months Impriſonment; for the ſecond, to be impriſoned during life: and if any ſhould print in defamation of it, or threaten Clergy-men for uſing of it, he was to be fined* 10 l. *for the firſt Offence,* 20 l. *for the ſecond, and for the third to forfeit all his Goods, and ſuffer Impriſonment during life.*

And as for the Reign of Queen *Mary*, let the *Book of Martyrs* be viewed, and it will appear that they who bore Teſtimony to the Truths of Chriſt, and truly deſerved the name of *Martyrdom*, were ſuch as were eminent Aſſertors of the *eſtabliſhed Epiſcopacy* and *Liturgie*; ſuch as *Cranmer*, *Ridley*, *Latimer*, *Hooper*, *Taylor*.

Leſt I ſhould lead my Reader into an Error, while I follow the Method of theſe Men, I thought fit to inform the Reader, That the *Erudition of a Chriſtian Man* was printed in the Year 1543. and the Reſolution of the Queſtions mentioned in the Paper by Dr. *Stillingfleet*, in the days of King *Edward* the Sixth; which whether they were conſulted of before (*viz.*) in the days of *Henry* the Eighth, is not material to enquire into: but the Method Mr. *H.* and Mr. *Lobb* uſed in the Reply to the Defence of Dr. *Stillingfleet*, in the Preface, ſaying, in *Henry* the Eighth's time, *Cranmer*, in Anſwer to that Queſtion, *Whether Biſhops or Prieſts were firſt?* did aſſert, *&c.* And that he did not vary from that Opinion, the ſame being by him aſſerted in the *Neceſſary Erudition*.

As to the Opinion of thoſe three Divines which are mentioned in this Chapter, *viz. Tindal*, *Lambert*, and *Barnes*, the firſt ſays, *That the Apoſtles ordained two Officers* (viz.) *Biſhop* or *Overſeer*, and *Deacon* or *Miniſter*; and adds, *That Deacons crept not into Orders till the Church grew Rich.*

Lambert he ſays was of the ſame Opinion, which he took from St. *Hierome*, who held Biſhops and Prieſts to be one and the ſame (of which we ſhall ſpeak hereafter). This *Lambert* was a ſtranger, come from *Avignon*, and would that every Pariſh ſhould have his proper Biſhop, and in every City there ought to be many Biſhops: This Mr. *Barnes* denies, and quotes St. *Paul*, who ſaid, *I have left thee behind me to ſet in every City a Biſhop.* And the Article againſt Mr. *Barnes* was, That he held, that one Man might not by the Law of God be a Biſhop of Two or Three Cities, or of a whole Country; he denyed not one Biſhop in a City, but thought that an Apoſtolical Inſtitution: His Opinion was, *That there ought not to be ſuch Biſhops as the Cardinal that examined him was:* Who told Mr. *Barnes*, *That this Article toucht him.* And it ſeems evident, that this Man ſpake againſt ſuch Uſurpations as the Pope and Cardinals exerciſed; wherein he agreed to the Sentiments of all thoſe that ſubſcribed the neceſſary *Erudition*.

And now there remains little too be ſaid of *Ch.* 2. for that which he ſays from a Statute *primo Edw.* 6. was brought in by a Parentheſis, as not part of the intention of the Statute, which was to be learnt from the Preamble, (*viz.*) *That the Election of Biſhops ſhould not be in the Deans and Chapters, to prevent Delays and Expences, but in the King*: So that it reſpects only the External

Go-

Government of the Church, which is ſtill acknowledged to be in the determination of the Magiſtrate, who is Supreme in all Cauſes, and over all Perſons. And therefore it needed not that Reflection of Dr. *Heylin*, which our Author mentioneth, *viz. That it did weaken the Authority of the Epiſcopal Order:* Which, (as hath been proved from the *Erudition*, and the Judgment of the Divines mentioned in Dr. *Stillingfleet*'s Paper) was from Chriſt.

As to Biſhop *Poynet*, the ſum of what he ſays is this, *Who knows not that the Name Biſhop hath been ſo abuſed, that when it was ſpoken the People underſtood no other thing but a great Lord,* —— (Where he ſeems to deſcribe a Cardinal, or Popiſh Biſhop) *that went in a white Rochet, with a wide ſhaven Crown, and that carried an Oil-Box with him, wherewith he uſeth once in Seven Years, Riding about, to Confirm Children.* Certainly, he could not mean this of Dioceſan Proteſtant Biſhops, he being then Biſhop of *Wincheſter*; and the Name of Biſhop being thus abuſed, he thought it not amiſs, if another word were uſed in its place, till the abuſed word were reſtored to its right Signification; and then adds: *O how the Papiſts would triumph over us, if they had like proof for the Names of Pope, Cardinal,* &c. *as we have for the maintenance of the Names Superintendent,* (i. e.) *in his ſenſe, Biſhop, Miniſter, and ſuch-like by us uſed.*

Ch. 3. He ſays, That *Aley* Biſhop of *Exeter*, *Pilkington* of *Durham*, *Jewel* of *Salisbury*, *Whitgift* Archbiſhop of *Canterbury* were of the ſame Opinion with *Tindal*, *Lambert*, and *Barnes*, and the Reformers in King *Edward*'s time, and what that was hath been conſidered; I only obſerve in general, that all theſe were Dioceſan Biſhops, and therefore probably would write nothing to deſtroy their own Order, That which Biſhop *Aley* ſays, is a Quotation from St. *Hierome*, *That a Presbyter and Biſhop are the ſame*, &c. But, ſaith Biſhop *Aley*, it grew by little and little, that the whole charge and care ſhould be appointed to one Biſhop within his Precinct. Our Author mentions another Quotation from the Biſhop out of St. *Hierome*, viz. *That Biſhops are greater than Prieſts, rather by Cuſtome than by Diſpenſation from the Lord*; of which hereafter. To the ſame effect he quotes *Pilkington* Biſhop of *Durham*, arguing againſt a Popiſh Author, and therefore probably againſt Popiſh Biſhops; and he ſays, *That God's Commiſſion is alike to all, Prieſt, Biſhop, Archbiſhop, and Prelate*; for which he quotes St. *Hierome*, *ad Evagrium*, *That a Biſhop where-ever he be, is of the ſame Power and Prieſthood*, which he urged againſt thoſe that ſtill claimed their Biſhop of *Rome*, uſurped Power above Princes, and other Biſhops; who as this Biſhop ſays, had no Authority to Suſpend, Deprive, and Interdict any Prieſt that paid not his Subſidies, but from the Parliament: I cannot ſee what inference the Author can make from this to favour his Opinion.

The ſum of what Biſhop *Jewel* ſays, is that of St. *Hierome*, *That all Prieſts are of the ſame Power; that the Names of Metropolitans, Archbiſhops, Archdeacons*, &c. *are not found in the S S.* That St. *Hierome* ſays, *Sciant Epiſcopi*; that they are in Authority over Prieſts more by Cuſtome, than by Order of God's Truth: And againſt *Harding* he ſays, *What meant Mr.* Harding *to*

come

come in with the difference between Priests and Bishops, thinketh he that Priests and Bishops hold only by Tradition; or is it so humble a Heresie to say, that by the SS of God, a Bishop and a Priest are all one: He grants also, *That it is by the favour of Princes, that a Priest being found negligent,* &c. *he may be punished by the discretion of the Bishop. That the Matters of Government must be taken out of the Word of God: (viz.) That the Word be truly taught, the Sacraments rightly administred, Vertue furthered, Vice repressed, and the Church kept in Quietness and Order: That the Officers whereby this Government is wrought, be not namely and particularly expressed in SS. but left to the discretion of the Church, according to the state of Times, Places, and Persons; and therefore no certain and perfect kind of Government being prescribed in SS, as necessary to the Salvation of the Church, the same may be altered:* For which he quotes *Gualter*—— *Let every Church follow the manner of Discipline which doth most agree with the people, and most fit for the time and place; and let no Man rashly prescribe to others, and bind all Churches to one Form: It is well known, that the Manner and Form of Government in the Apostles times, and expressed in the SS, neither is now, nor can, nor ought to be observed.* This he wrote against *Cartwright*, pleading for his Government, as if prescribed in SS, and thus he applies it to the then Dissenters: *If you will have the Queen Rule as Monarch in her own Dominions, you must give her leave to use one kind and form of Government, in all, and every part, and so to Govern the Church in Ecclesiastical Affairs, as in Civil.* I wish they would follow his Example and Advice, that so seem to recommend his Judgment.

Ch. 4. begins with Dr. *Willet*'s Opinion, who says, 'That of the difference between Bishops and Priests there are Three Opinions; the first of *Arrius*, who held that all Ministers should be equal; and that a Bishop was 'not, nor ought to be superiour to a Priest; nor was there any difference at 'all between them. Which Opinion was counted an Heresie. *N. B.*

The Second in the other extream is of the Papists, 'That would have not 'only a difference, but a Princely Preheminence of their Bishops over the 'Clergy, and that by the Word of God.

The Third Opinion between both, is: 'That although this distinction of 'Bishops and Priests, as now received, cannot be directly proved out of SS, 'yet it is very good for the Polity of the Church, to avoid Schism, and to 'preserve it in Unity: And he concludes. So then here is a difference between our Adversaries the Papists, and us; they say, It is of necessity to Salvation to be subject to the Pope, and to Bishops, and Archbishops under him, as necessarily prescribed in the Word: But so do not our Bishops and Archbishops, which is a notable difference between the Bishops of the Popish Church, and the Reformed Churches.

Let every Church use the Form which best fitteth their State in External Matters. *N. B.* Every Church is free, not one bound to the Prescription of another: So they measure themselves by the Rule of the Word. This then (he says) may without any contradiction be affirmed, that in this distinction of the Ministers of the Church, there is somewhat Apostolical, somewhat also

Political:

Political: First, in the calling of Biſhops, as now ordained in ſome Reformed Church, it cannot be denied but that we have Order in the Church; and to have diverſity of Degrees and Miniſtrations, to avoid Confuſion, proceeds from an Inſtitution of Chriſt, that there ſhould not be a popular Equality, but a convenient Superiority, and Priority in the Miniſters of the Goſpel; as St. *Paul* alſo ſheweth: Firſt Apoſtles, ſecond Prophets, *&c.* Secondly, There is ſomewhat Politick, and that of two ſorts, as touching the Polity Eccleſiaſtical and Civil. To the Eccleſiaſtical, in advancing the Dignity of Biſhops theſe things appertain: 1. St. *Hierome* ſays of Confirmation, That it is committed only to Biſhops; that it is rather for the honour of the Prieſthood, then by neceſſity of any Law. 2. The Council of *Aquiſgrane*, ch. 8, ſaith, 'That the Ordination and Conſecration of Miniſters is now reſerved to the 'chief Miniſter only for Authority's-ſake, leſt that the Diſcipline of the Church 'being changed by many, ſhould break the Peace of the Church. 3. The Author of the Book under *Hierome*'s Name, *De Septem Ordinibus*, ſaith, 'That the Conſecration of Virgins, which is not now in uſe in the Reformed 'Churches, was reſerved to the Biſhop for Concord's ſake. 4. The Juriſdiction of the Church, which in times paſt (*Hierome* ſays) was committed to the Colledge of Presbyters, was afterwards, to avoid Schiſm, devolved to the Biſhop. Among other Inferences from Dr. *Willet*, he concludes, 'That *Willet* 'indeed ſaith, that for the ſake of Order, the Preſidence of one above the reſt 'is Divine and Apoſtolical: And at the latter end of Queen *Elizabeth*, the Epiſcopal Government is affirm'd to be Apoſtolical, and a Divine Inſtitution: And as to *Saravia*, our Author gives his Judgment in theſe two particulars, differing from *Whitgift*: 1. That not only the Miniſtry of the Word and Sacraments, but the Form of Government inſtituted by the Lord himſelf, delivered by the Apoſtles, confirmed by the Fathers, ought to be continued forever. 2. The Superiority in degree of a Biſhop, above a Presbyter, is a Divine Inſtitution; and that St. *Hierome* was in the ſame Error with *Arrius*: *Dico privatam fuiſſe Hieronimi Opinionem conſentaneam cum Arrio & Dei verbo contrariam.* The laſt that he mentioneth in this *Ch.* is Biſhop *Bancroft*, who ſays, 'We have a Church-Government, which in my Conſcience is truly 'Apoſtolical, and far to be preferred before any other received this day in 'any Reformed Church in *Chriſtendome*. And after the Death of the Apoſtles, who did overſee both Churches, Paſtors, and Biſhops, or Superintendents, Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtories, and ancient Fathers have kept a Regiſter of their Names, who Succeeded and Ruled the Churches after them.—And this inequality hath been approved and honoured by all the Ancient Fathers, none excepted, and by all the General Councils, and by all other Men of Learning, for many hundred Years after the Apoſtles time, ſaving *Arrius* the Heretick, who miſſing of a Biſhoprick that he ſued for, firſt broached the Opinion, That there ought to be no difference between a Biſhop and a Prieſt. *N. B.*

That which Biſhop *Bancroft* notes from Dr. *Robinſon*, is this: 'I have 'maintain'd that the Titles of Honour given to our Biſhops, are no more repugnant

'pugnant to the Word, than for us to be called Wardens or Presidents of Colledges, and in my Judgment they may with as good Conscience be Governors of their Dioces, as we being Ministers may Govern Colledges of Ministers. Nor do I think this was a late devised Polity; for I am perswaded, that the Angel of the Church of *Ephesus*, to whom St. *John* writes, was one Minister set over the rest; for why, seeing there were many Pastors there, should St. *John* write to the Angel, and not to the Angels, if there had been no difference among them; neither if this Presidency had had that fault which is reproved in *Diotrephes*, would our Saviour, who reproveth those Disorders which he found in the Seven Churches, have passed over this great fault in silence; therefore as *Titus* was left in *Creet* to reform the Churches in that whole Island, so I am perswaded, that in other Places some of that Order, and of Pastors and Teachers, which is perpetual in the Church, even in the time of the Apostles, and had a Prelacy among their Brethren, and that this Preheminence is approved by our Saviour. And to come lower, tho' the word *Episcopus* signifieth, that care which is required of all, and be in SS required of all that have care of Souls; yet I do not remember any one Ecclesiastical Writer wherein that word doth not import a greater Dignity than is common to all Ministers; neither do I think that any old Writer did under the Name of Bishop mean the Pastor of every Parish: Thus Dr. *Robinson*, with whom, if Dr. *Raynolds* do agree, I see not (*saith he*) whether the Factioners will turn them; for this Doctor in his Book against *Hart* saith, That in the Church of *Ephesus*, though it had sundry Elders and Pastors to guide it, yet among those was there one Chief, whom our Saviour calleth the Angel of the Church; and this is he, whom after, in the Primitive Church, the Fathers called Bishop: For, *&c.* He proceeds thus:

'The Name of Bishop, common before to all Elders and Pastors of the Church, was then, by the usual Language of the Fathers, appropriated to him who had the Presidentship over the Elders. Thus are certain Elders reproved by St. *Cyprian* Bishop of *Carthage*, for receiving to the Communion them who had fallen in time of Persecution, before the Bishop had advised with them, and others. These Two are for *Oxford*, touching the Language of the Ancient Fathers, speaking of Bishops. Now you shall have a *Cambridge* Man's Opinion, Dr. *Fulke*, who in confutation of the *Rhemish* Testament, says: 'Among the Clergy for Order and seemly Government, there was always one Principal, to whom, by long use of the Church, the Name of Bishop, or Superintendant hath been applied; which room *Titus* exercised in *Creet*, *Timothy* in *Ephesus*, and others in other places; therefore, altho' in SS a Bishop and an Elder is of one Order and Authority in Preaching the Word, and Administring the Sacraments, as *Hierome* doth often confess; yet in Government, by ancient use of Speech, he is onely called a Bishop, which is in SS so called, *Rom.* 12. 8. 1 *Tim.* 5. 17. *Heb.* 13. 7. ἡγούμενοι καὶ ποιμένες καὶ ἐπίσκοποι: Chief in Government, to whom the Ordination, or Consecration, by Imposition of Hands, was always principally committed; which most Ancient Form of Government, when *Arrius* would

' take away, it was noted among his other Errors. So I hereby truſt it may appear to Mr. *Cartwright*'s reproach, and to all their ſhames, that ſhall pretend any Authority from the Ancient Fathers, to impugne the Right Honourable and Lawful Calling of Biſhops, not Parſons in every Pariſh, but Biſhops in their Dioceſs and Province, appointed in the Apoſtles times, for the right Order and Government of the Church of Chriſt. As to Biſhop *Spotswood*'s Hiſtory of *Scotland*, *p.* 514, concerning the Ordination of the Three *Scots* Biſhops in King *James*'s time, Biſhop *Andrews* urged, That it might not be done, becauſe they were not duly made Presbyters, (*i. e.*) by Biſhops; but the Archbiſhop conſidering that this might reflect on the Reformed Churches that had no Biſhops, which was the condition alſo of *Scotland*, where Epiſcopal Ordination could not be had, it was diſpenſed with. But this is not the Caſe of our Diſſenters, who refuſe Epiſcopal Ordination where it may be had, and ſet up the Presbyterian againſt it.

Ch. 5. Begins with the Judicious Mr. *Hooker*, from whom, after a long Quotation, he infers, *p.* 37. 'That the Polity in general be neceſſary to the 'Church; yet it is not neceſſary that any one Temporal Polity be in the SS: This being the Poſition of the *Non-Cons*, Mr. *Hooker* makes this uſe of it: '——You cannot ſo much as pretend to this ground, that all the parts of your 'Diſcipline are in SS; and your Mouths are ſtopt, when you plead againſt 'all other Forms, ſeeing their Polity may be agreeable to the general Axiomes 'of SS, as well as yours: And therefore, he ſays, The beſt way for our 'Cauſe, and the ſtrongeſt againſt them, is to hold, (*as the Non-Cons do*) that 'in SS there muſt needs be found ſome particular Form of Church-Govern-'ment which God hath inſtituted, and belongs to all Churches at all times; 'but by partiality and cunning, to make thoſe things trueſt which are fit-'teſt to ſerve our purpoſe, is what we neither like, nor mean to follow. In *p.* 38. Mr. *Hooker* ſays:

Firſt, 'That in the Clergy there have ever been, and ought to be ſome 'ſubordinate to others, as the Apoſtles in the beginning, and to Biſhops ever 'ſince; as in SS, and all Eccleſiaſtical Records other Miniſters have been.

Secondly, 'That a ſolemn admittance (*viz.* of Miniſters into the Church) 'is of ſuch neceſſity, that without it there can be no Church Polity. Theſe he ſays are the perpetual and principal parts in Eccleſiaſtical Polity: And this is all that Mr. *J. H.* hath noted out of thoſe Books of Mr. *Hooker*, which are generally allowed to be genuine; which being not much for his purpoſe, he goes to the Seventh Book, and there he finds this diſcription of a Biſhop: 'A Biſhop is a Miniſter of God, to whom with permanent continuance, not 'only a Power of Adminiſtring the Word and Sacraments is given, (which 'other Presbyters have) but a farther Power to Ordain Eccleſiaſtical Perſons, 'and a Power of Chiefty in Government over Presbyters as well as Lay-men, 'a Power to be by way of Juriſdiction a Paſtor, even to Paſtors themſelves. And the things which properly belong to a Biſhop, cannot be common to other Paſtors; and of Biſhops reſtrained to ſome definite local compaſs he ſays, their Regiment we hold to be a thing moſt Divine and Holy in the Church of Chriſt: In two things *J. H.* notes that *Hooker* differs from the

Non-

Non-Cons, p. 40. 1. They make the Superiority or Priority of Order to be but Temporary; he makes it permanent. 2. They deny the Biſhops have any Power over other Paſtors, that is Mandatory, Judicial, and Coercive, Mr. *Hooker* affirms it: Then he ſhews how Mr. *Hooker* reſolves a Sentence of St. *Hierome*, which ſeems inconſiſtent with itſelf: *viz.* 'How the Apoſtles 'ſhould be the Authors of that Government, (*i. e.*) Epiſcopacy, and yet the 'Cuſtom of the Church be accounted the chief Prop of it. To which the ſubſtance of his Anſwer is, That what Laws the Univerſal Church might change, and doth not, St. *Hierome* aſcribes the continuance of ſuch Laws, tho' inſtituted by God himſelf, to the Judgment of the Church, for they which may abrogate a Law, and do not, may be ſaid to eſtabliſh it; and ſeeing the whole Church receiving it for a Cuſtome, which was eſtabliſhed by them, on whom the Holy Ghoſt was in an abundant manner poured out for ordering of Chriſt's Church, it had either Divine appointment before-hand, or Divine approbation afterwards. Now how Mr. *J. H.* could from theſe premiſes draw this following concluſion, I cannot perceive, *p.* 44. 'Let 'there be, *ſaith he*, as many Biſhopricks, as there are conſiderable Perſona-'ges, and a Proviſion made for the Presbyters which are to aſſiſt the Biſhops 'in the Government of the Churches; and then a Superiority of the Bi-'ſhop above the Presbyters, will be no longer a Bone of Contention. The Senſe whereof ſeems to me to be this: Let the Presbyters in every Pariſh have all the Power that belongs to Biſhops, and then, and not elſe, they will be pleaſed. But the Judicious *Hooker* would not have been ſo pleaſed with them that ſhould have inferred this concluſion from any premiſes of his. That which followeth out of Mr. *Hooker's* maimed Book, is, 1. That the Church Viſible hath not ordinarily allowed any but Biſhops alone to Ordain; howbeit, in ſome neceſſary Caſes, we may decline from the ordinary ways. 2. That Confirmation hath not always belonged to the Biſhops, but in ſome places, in the abſence of the Biſhop, the Presbyter might Ordain. 3. That the Presbyters are for the moſt part mentioned as Counſellors and Aſſiſtants to the Biſhop.

The laſt Biſhop whom he would conſtrain to help on his New Model, is Biſhop *Bilſon*, who ſays, *That to prevent Diſſention and Confuſion, there muſt needs, even by God's Ordinance, be a Preſident, or Ruler of every Presbytery; but that in the Apoſtles times the Preſidentſhip ſhould go round to every Presbyter by courſe; this is the main point between us.* Then he ſays, *There are Four Things muſt be perpetual in the Church.* 1. *The Diſpenſing of the Word.* And 2. *Sacraments.* 3. *Impoſing of Hands.* 4. *Guiding the Keyes to ſhut or open the Kingdom of God. The firſt Two belong to all Paſtors or Presbyters, but it belongs to ſome ſelected perſons who ſucceed in the Apoſtles places, to moderate the Presbyters of each Church, and to take the ſpecial Charge of Impoſition of Hands. And this ſingularity in ſucceeding, and ſuperiority in ordaining, hath been obſerved from the Apoſtles times, as the peculiar and ſubſtantial Marks of Epiſcopal Power and Calling.*

As to the Power of the Keyes, the private uſe of them in appointing Offenders, upon the acknowledgement of their ſins, to forbear the Lord's Table

for a time, we deny not to Presbyters; but the Bishop is by Christ's own mouth, pronounced to be the Angel of the Church, the chief Steward of his Houshold, to hear and determine Grievances, with whom the Presbyters sate at first as Assessors; but when Councils began, only as Beholders and Advisers of his Judgment; and he adds, that the right by imposing Hands to Ordain Presbyters and Bishops, was at first derived from the Apostles to Bishops, and not to Presbyters. *N. B.* And for 1500 Years without instance or example to the contrary, till this our Age, remained in Bishops, and not in Presbyters; for which he quotes St. *Hierome: Quid facit excepta ordinatione Episcopus quod non facit Presbyter.* *J. H.* observes, that whereas it is objected, That Imposition of Hands was by the Presbytery; he answers out of St. *Chrysostom*, that by the word Presbytery in SS, must be understood Bishops not Presbyters; because Presbyters in the Apostles time did not impose Hands on a Bishop. And from this Bishop he adds, All that we can say for Bishops above Presbyters out of SS is, that the Holy Ghost, by the mouth of St. *Paul*, hath given the Bishop of each place Authority to Ordain the worthy, to examine such as be faulty, to reprove and discharge such as be guilty, either of unsound Teaching, or offensive Living; and this he saith belongs to all Bishops of Christ's Church forever. I have transcribed so much of these Quotations, because the very repetition of them is a confutation of that Design, which Mr. *H.* attempts, and will shew it to be not a healing, but a very hurtful Attempt, as precluding that way of Peace and Reconciliation which is generally intended, if the unreasonable Demands of some unquiet Men do not put a bar to it.

Thus saith Mr. *J. H. I have gone through the principal Writers about Church Government in Queen* Elizabeth's *Reign:* And indeed he hath cull'd out such Foundations on which he would build his Hay and Stubble, as will no way suit with them. I shall not prepossess the Reader with the inferences which *J. H.* would force from them; but leave every Man to consider, whether he can fix his Half-sheet Model on these Concessions; and now briefly inform the Reader of the Judgment of some of these Divines, and some States-men, what Qualifications he and such Master-Builders are endowed with, for the Building of a Temple fit for the Publick Worship of God and our Saviour: And I shall begin with,

The Speech of the Lord Keeper Puckering *to the House of Lords, by Order of Queen* Elizabeth.

"ESpecially you are commanded by Her Majesty, to take heed that no "ear be given, nor time afforded to the wearisome Sollicitations of "those that are commonly called *Puritans*, wherewithal the late Parliament "have been exceedingly importuned; which sort of Men, while in the gid-"dines of their Spirits they labour and strive to advance a new Eldership, "they do nothing else but distract the good Repose of the Church and Com-"mon-wealth, which is as well grounded for the body of Religion it self, "and as well guided for the Discipline, as any Realm that professeth the "Truth";

" Truth; and as the preſent caſe ſtandeth, it may be doubted, whether they " or the Jeſuits offer more danger, or are to be more ſpeedily ſuppreſt; for " albeit the Jeſuits do poiſon the Hearts of Her Majeſty's Subjects, under a " pretence of Conſcience, they do it but cloſely, and only in corners, but " theſe Men do both publiſh in their printed Books, and teach in all their " Conventicles, ſundry Opinions, not only dangerous to the well-ſetled State " and Policy of the Realm, by putting a Pique between the Clergy and the " Laity, but alſo much derogatory to her Sacred Majeſty and her Crown, " as well by the diminution of her Ancient and Lawful Revenues, and by " denying her Highneſs's Prerogative and Supremacy, as by offering Peril to " Her Majeſty's Safety in her own Kingdom; in all which things (however " in many other points) they pretend to be at War with the Popiſh Jeſuits, " yet by the ſeparation of themſelves from the Unity of their Fellow-Sub- " jects, and by abuſing the Sacred Authority and Majeſty of their Prince, " they do both joyn and concur with the Jeſuits in opening the Door, and pre- " paring the way to the *Spaniſh* Invaſion that is threatned againſt the Realm.

And in the Year 1588, as *Cambden* obſerves in his Annals, the King of *Spain* being thereto encouraged by an Information of the great Diviſions and Animoſities among us, by Reaſon whereof he expected either a greater Party to joyn with him, or a leſs Oppoſition, ſent his Invincible Armado upon our Coaſts; at which time the Proteſtant Diſſenters, inſtead of Arming in Defence of the Queen and themſelves, did with greater Importunity and Confidence aſſault her with Petitions and Libels, taking advantage of the Times, as if they were more ready to aſſiſt the *Spaniards* than Her Majeſty, in caſe their unreaſonable Requeſts were not granted. As for Biſhop *Jewel*, if he ſaid any thing in their favour, they ill requited him, for on his Preaching a Sermon at St. *Paul's Croſs*, in defence of the Orders of the Church, and Obedience to them, he was ſo ſpitefully uſed by them, that in his own Vindication, he made a Solemn Proteſtation on his Death-bed, that what he then ſaid, was neither to pleaſe ſome, nor diſpleaſe others, but to promote Peace and Unity among Brethren; of which Arch-Biſhop *Whitgift* in his Defence, *p.* 433. ſays, *It is the manner, except you pleaſe their Humour in all things, though you otherwiſe deſerve never ſo well, all is nothing with them, but they will deprave you, rail on you, back-bite you, invent lyes of you, and ſpread falſe rumours, as though you were the vileſt perſons on Earth.* By theſe inſolent proceedings of the Sectaries and Papiſts in Confederacy, the Queen was neceſſitated to paſs thoſe Acts of the 23 and 35 of her Reign, to retain Her Majeſty's Subjects in due Obedience. And this alſo gave occaſion to that Proclamation of the Queen 1588. againſt Seditious and Schiſmatical Books and Libels.

By

By the QUEEN.

A Proclamation againſt certain Seditious and Schiſmatical Books and Libels, &c.

THE Queens moſt Excellent Majeſty, conſidering how within theſe few years paſt, and now of late, certain ſeditious and evil-diſpoſed perſons towards her Majeſty, and the Government eſtabliſhed for cauſes Eccleſiaſtical within her Majeſty's Dominions, have deviſed, written, printed, or cauſed to be ſeditiouſly and ſecretly publiſhed and diſperſed, ſundry ſchiſmatical and ſeditious Books, diffamatory Libels, and other Phanatical Writings amongſt her Majeſty's Subjects, containing in them Doctrine very erroneous, and other matters notoriouſly untrue, and ſlanderous to the State, and againſt the Godly Reformation of Religion and Government Eccleſiaſtical eſtabliſhed by Law, and ſo quietly of long time continued, and alſo againſt the perſons of Biſhops, and others placed in Authority Eccleſiaſtical under her Highneſs by her Authority, in railing ſort, and beyond the bounds of all good humanity: All which Books, Libels, and Writings, tend by their ſcope to perſwade and bring in a monſtrous and apparent dangerous Innovation within her Dominions and Countries, of all manner of Eccleſiaſtical Government now in uſe, and to the abridging, or rather to the overthrow of her Highneſs lawful Prerogative, allowed by God's Law, and eſtabliſhed by the Laws of the Realm, and conſequently to reverſe, diſſolve, and ſet at liberty the preſent Government of the Church, and to make a dangerous change of the form of Doctrine, and uſe of Divine Service of God, and the Miniſtration of the Sacraments now alſo in uſe, with a raſh and malicious purpoſe alſo to diſſolve the Eſtate of the Prelacy, being one of the three ancient Eſtates of this Realm under her Highneſs, whereof her Majeſty mindeth to have ſuch a reverend regard, as to their places in the Church and Common-wealth appertaineth. All which ſaid lewd and ſeditious practices, do directly tend to the manifeſt wilful breach of great number of good Laws and Statutes of this Realm, inconveniencies nothing regarded by ſuch Innovations.

In conſideration whereof, her Highneſs graciouſly minding to provide ſome good and ſpeedy Remedy to withſtand ſuch notable, dangerous, and ungodly Attempts, and for that purpoſe to have ſuch enormous Malefactors diſcovered and condignly puniſhed, doth ſignifie this her Highneſs miſliking and indignation of ſuch dangerous and wicked Enterprizes; and for that purpoſe doth hereby will and alſo ſtraightly charge and command, that all perſons whatſoever, within any her Majeſty's Realms and Dominions, who have or hereafter ſhall have any of the ſaid ſeditious Books, Pamphlets, Libels, or Writings, or any of like nature already publiſhed, or hereafter to be publiſhed, in his or their cuſtody, containing ſuch matters as above are mentioned, againſt the preſent Order and Government of the Church of England, or the Lawful Miniſters thereof, or againſt the Rites and Ceremonies uſed in the Church, and allowed by the Laws of the Realm: That they and every of them do preſently after, with convenient ſpeed, bring in, and deliver up the ſame unto the Ordinary of the Dioceſs, or of the place where they

they inhabit, to the intent they may be utterly defaced by the ſaid Ordinary, or otherwiſe uſed by them. And that from henceforth no perſon or perſons whatſoever be ſo hardy as to write, contrive, print, or cauſe to be publiſhed or diſtributed or to keep any of the ſame, or any other Books, Libels, or Writings of like nature and quality, contrary to the true meaning and intent of this her Majeſty's Proclamation. And likewiſe that no man hereafter give any inſtruction, direction, favour, or aſſiſtance to the contriving, writing, printing, publiſhing, or diſperſing of the ſame, or ſuch like Books, Libels, or Writings whatſoever, as they tender her Majeſty's good favour, will avoid her high diſpleaſure, and as they will anſwer the contrary at their utmoſt perils: and upon ſuch pains and penalties, as by the Law any way may be inflicted upon the offenders, in any of theſe behalfs, as perſons maintaining ſuch ſeditious actions, which her Majeſty mindeth to have ſeverely executed. And if any perſon have had knowledge of the Authors, Writers, Printers, or Diſperſers thereof, which ſhall within one Month after the publication hereof, diſcover the ſame to the Ordinary of the place where he had ſuch knowledge, or to any of her Majeſty's Privy Council: the ſame perſon ſhall not for his former concealment be hereafter moleſted or troubled. Given at her Majeſty's Palace at Weſtminſter, *the thirteenth of* February, 1588. *In the One and thirtieth Year of her Highneſs Reign.*

GOD SAVE THE QUEEN.

Arch-biſhop *Grindall* expreſt in a Letter of his, his great fear of two things (*viz.*) Atheiſm and Popery, and both ariſing out of our needleſs Diviſions; by theſe means the Enemies of our Religion gain this, that nothing can be eſtabliſhed by Law in the Proteſtant Religion, whoſe every part is not oppoſed by one or other of her own Profeſſors; ſo that things continuing looſe and confuſed, the Papiſts have their Opportunity to urge their way, which is attended with Order and Government. And our Religion continuing thus diſtracted and divided, ſome vile wretches lay hold on the Argument on one ſide to confute the other, and ſo at laſt to deſtroy all. And it is obſerved in the Life of Mr. *Hooker*, *p.* 9. they perſwaded men to believe that the Biſhops were *Antichriſt*, and *Antichriſt* was to be deſtroyed by the Sword; and beginning with Petitions, they proceeded to Admonitions, then to Remonſtrances, then to numbring their Party, then to that boldneſs, that one told the Queen in a Sermon, *She was like an untamed Heifer, that would not be ruled by God's people, but obſtructed his Diſcipline.* And we have heard and ſeen worſe things in our days.

Arch-biſhop *Whitgift* in his Defence of the Anſwer to T. C. *p.* 605. tells the Puritans, 'That the Papiſts could not have met with better Proctors than 'they. And 55. That they did the Pope very good Service, and that he 'would not miſs them for any thing: for what is his deſire, but to have this 'Church of *England*, which he hath accurſed, utterly defaced and diſcredited, to have it by any means overthrown, if not by Foreign means, yet by 'Domeſtical Diſſention. And what fitter Inſtruments could he have had for 'that purpoſe, who under pretence of Zeal overthrow that which other men

'have

'have builded; under colour of Purity, ſeek to bring in Deformity; and 'under the Cloak of Equality and Humility, would uſurp as great Tyran-'ny and loſty Lordlineſs over their Pariſhes, as ever the Pope did over the 'whole Church, and that they were made the Engines of the *Roman* Con-'clave, whereby they intend to overthrow this Church even by theſe mens 'Folly, which they could not compaſs by all their Policy. The Epiſtle of the Arch-biſhop to the Reader, before his Defence of the Anſwer to *T. C's* Admonition, is worth peruſal.

As for Biſhop *Bancroft*, the whole deſign of his Book is to manifeſt what diſturbance the endeavours of the Presbyterians to eſtabliſh their Elderſhip, did create in the Nation by ſuch dangerous Poſitions and Practices, as were in his time with equal violence and malice carried on for the deſtruction of the Church, as it was then eſtabliſhed. There are ſome other of the mentioned Divines, whoſe Writings I have not, nor is there need to enquire farther into them, ſeeing there is nothing alledged from them by Mr. *J. H.* but what being compared with their other ſayings and practices doth fully fruſtrate his deſigns. And when the Biſhops of our Church do ſo ingenuouſly mention all that may be ſaid for their Adverſaries, with ſo much Veracity, Candor, and Moderation, what a Reproach is it to their Opponents, to deal with them with ſo much Scorn and Contempt, ſuch Bitterneſs and Paſſion, ſuch Slanders and Falſhoods, as too many do, and as *T. C.* did with the Arch-biſhop *Whitgift*, whom Queen *Elizabeth* called her *black Husband*, and up-held him againſt the Contrivances and contrary Deſigns of *Lecheſter*, and thoſe Conformiſts whom he favoured, to promote his own Sacrilegious ends.

As for Mr. *Hooker*, whom Biſhop *King* calls *Malleum Hereticorum*, who was as meek and modeſt a man, as well as judicious, as any in his Generation, he did profeſs to the Arch-biſhop, *See p. 17. of his Life*, 'That he be-'lieved his Adverſary, Mr. *Travers*. to be a good man, and that occaſioned 'him to examine his own Conſcience concerning his Opinions, and to ſatis-'fie that, he conſulted the Holy Scripture and other Laws Humane and Di-'vine, whether the Conſcience of him, and others of his judgment, ought 'ſo far to be complyed with, as to alter the frame of Church-Government, 'and manner of Worſhip and Ceremonies as oft as their tender Conſciences 'ſhall require it; in which examination he had not only ſatisfied himſelf, but 'begun his Eccleſiaſtical Polity for the ſatisfaction of others, which he juſtly 'calls, a Demonſtration of the Reaſonableneſs of our Eccleſiaſtical Laws, and 'a hopeful Foundation for the Churches Peace, and not to provoke either 'Mr. *T. C.* the Arch-biſhop's Adverſary, nor Mr. *Travers*, whom, ſaith Mr. 'Hooker, I take to be mine (not mine Enemy) God knows this to be my 'meaning. Yet his Adverſaries that could not anſwer his Arguments, contrived to blot his Reputation, and accuſed him of Incontinency, which by a Trepan, as the Author of his Life relates, *p.* 22. they endeavoured to faſten on him; he kept this Grief to himſelf many Months, with great anxiety, until he revealed it to Mr. *Edwin Sands* and *George Cranmer*, who had been his Pupils, who enquiring into the Impoſture, ſo followed it, that they brought his Accuſers to open Confeſſion and Puniſhment, which Puniſhment he endea-

endeavoured to prevent, but was denied; at which he replyed, *That however he would Fast and Pray, that God would give them Repentance, and Patience to undergo their Punishment*; and the first part was granted, if we may believe, saith my Author, the penitent Behaviour, and open Confession of his Accuser.

How his Adversaries dealt with his Books after his Death, is thus related. That one Mr. *Clark* and another Minister desired of his Widow a Month after his Death to search his Study for some Papers, wherof they burnt some, and tore others; but Dr. *Jackson* having transcribed some draught of his three last Books, they were compleated by Dr. *Spencer*, who was acquainted with the Design of those Books. The Doctor left them with Dr. *King*, Bishop of *London*, and he to his Son, Bishop of *Chichester*, he to Dr. *Abbot*, Arch-bishop of *Canterbury*, in whose Library they continued till the Death of Arch-bishop *Laud*, and then the Library was given to *Hugh Peters* for his good Services, and then many alterations and additions were made in them, to make them speak for the power of the People above the King, for which, when the Lord *Say* quoted *Hooker*'s Authority to King *Charles* the First, he replyed, *That the Books were not* Hooker's; *but however he would consent to what was proposed out of those doubted Books, if that Lord would consent to Mr.* Hooker's *Judgment in those Books which were undoubted.* The same may I say concerning the Judgment of such Divines as Mr. *J. H.* hath quoted, we will stand to what is but weakly and impertinently quoted from those Divines, if they will stand to what is more maturely and pertinently by them alledged and proved, agreeably also to their own practice for Diocesan Episcopacy, as established in the Church of *England.*

If those Dissenters who were so importunate and industrious to advance their Discipline on the ruines of the established Church, had proceeded on the Principles laid down by the Divines above-mentioned, whereof this is one that they lay hold on (*viz.*) *That the forms of Government not being plainly expresst in Scripture, are alterable, and may by the Authority of the Civil Magistrate be determined to this or that species* (which yet they will not grant of their own Discipline) *they ought then to acquiesce in that Government which was established, and to which all those Divines most willingly submitted, as the best in all the Christian World; and though by reason of their dissent from it, they had drawn on themselves the execution of some moderate Penalties, yet if they had been fully perswaded that they did suffer for a good Conscience, and for Righteousness sake, they ought like good Christians to have taken it patiently, and not by Railing, by Sedition, by forming Schisms, and meditating Rebellions, seek to avenge themselves, and return evil for evil, but contrarily blessing, being thereto called by the Example and Precepts of their great Master; but when they returned evil for good, and hatred for good-will, and thought themselves persecuted, because they could not grasp a Power to persecute their Superiours; this was not agreeable to that wisdom that comes from above, which is first pure, then peaceable, gentle, and easie to be intreated.* And if our present Dissenters be satisfied of the purity of our Doctrine, they may by the Principles which are laid down, submit to that Discipline and Government

that Authority doth eſtabliſh, there being nothing in it contrary to the Word of God, but wholly agreeable to the conſtant practice of the Univerſal Church.

I think it ſufficient to ſolve all that hath been alledged out of our Divines to clear theſe two things.

1. What kind of Government was ſetled by the Apoſtles.

2. What Anſwer may be given to the Objections ſo often mentioned from St. *Hierom.*

As to the firſt, it is evident, that there was a Superiority in the Apoſtles to thoſe to whom they committed the care of the ſeveral Churches, whether they were Biſhops or Presbyters; and as the Apoſtles dyed, their Succeſſors in Eccleſiaſtical Power, who in all Ages were the Biſhops, were the Subjects of that Superiority; ſuch as *Timothy, Titus, Clemen, Linus, &c.* and their Succeſſors as they ſtand recorded in Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory; for what the Apoſtles did for the perpetual Order and Government of the Church, was agreeable to our Saviour's Inſtitution, and all Antiquity bears proof to this Truth, that from the Apoſtles days there were ſetled in the moſt eminent Churches of *Hieruſalem, Rome, Antioch,* and *Alexandria,* ſeveral Biſhops that had a Superiority over the Presbyters, in their reſpective Churches, and that the three Orders of Biſhops, Prieſts, and Deacons, were eſtabliſhed in thoſe Churches in thoſe pureſt and moſt Primitive times; inſomuch that they who will not admit thoſe Teſtimonies, will be to ſeek for one of the beſt Proofs for the Canon of the Scripture. As therefore we believe the Succeſſion of *Roman* Emperours from the Writings of ſuch Hiſtorians as lived near their times, ſo may we believe the truth of ſuch Orders of Men, and of their Succeſſions, as it is delivered by Men of good Credit and Honeſty, that lived near thoſe times, and have handed down in undoubted written Records, from Age to Age, St. *Polycarp, Ignatius, Clemens,* who converſed with the Apoſtles; *Ireneus, Juſtin Martyr,* and others, that lived with them; then *Origen, Clem. Alexandrinus, Tertullian,* who ſucceeded them, and many others, who lived within two hundred years after the Apoſtles, from whom *Euſebius* had the Materials of his Hiſtory, and refers to them for the truth of his Relations.

He had the Acts of the Martyrs, and the Books of *Hegeſippus,* concerning the Acts of the Church; from which, and other helps, from the very Perſecutors of the Chriſtians, he compiled his Hiſtory, and particularly the Succeſſion of Biſhops. *Clemens Rom.* in his Epiſtle to the *Corinthians,* ſpeaks of the Officers of the Church in his time, alluding to thoſe under the Law: The High-Prieſt hath his Office, the Prieſt his Station, and the Levite his Miniſtry, the Lay-man his Office; let every one worſhip God in his Order. *Ignatius* mentions theſe Three Orders in his Epiſtles ſo plainly, that the Enemies of thoſe Orders have martyred him again in his Reputation, denying his Epiſtles to be genuine, which the Learned Biſhop *Pearſon* hath irrefragably aſſerted; and ſo hath Dr. *Beveridge* the Authority of Apoſtolical Canons, which have been owned by the Councils, and expreſly aſſert the Three Orders; ſo that tho' while the Apoſtles lived the Names might be confounded, yet immediately on their deaths, all Ancient Writers have diſtinguiſhed them;

becauſ

becauſe ſuch as ſucceeded to their Power were Biſhops; and yet all the Miniſters or Elders were not ſo, for a Parity is uſually the Parent of Confuſion; and if ſuch a Parity had been ſetled by Chriſt or his Apoſtles, how could it be, that as St. *Hierom* ſays, *The whole World ſhould agree for prevention of Schiſm, to alter what Chriſt had eſtabliſhed:* Was the whole World *(i. e.)* every particular Church (which are it ſeems agreed on ſetting up a Biſhop above Presbyters) wiſer than our Saviour; or had they Authority ſo to do? And if they did ſo by ſufficient Authority, why will the Presbyters as generally agree to pull them down now, as their Ancients did to ſet them up? So that I ſee no ſhadow of Reaſon, why we may not ſubſcribe to that which is ſaid before the Book of Conſecration, *That it is evident to all Men diligently reading the Holy Scripture, and Ancient Authors, that from the Apoſtles time, there have been ever theſe Orders of Miniſters in the Church, Biſhops, Prieſts, and Deacons.*

2. As to St. *Hierom*'s Teſtimony, the import of it is this, That tho' the Apoſtles had a Superiority over Presbyters, yet when they died they did not bequeath that Power to others, but left it in common to the Presbyters, whoſe management of it was ſuch, as it begat Schiſms and Animoſities; for ſuppreſſion of which it was thought fit through the whole World, to chuſe out of the body of the Presbyters, one that ſhould have a Preſidency over the reſt; ſo that this Preſidency was not an Apoſtolical Inſtitution, but Eccleſiaſtical and Prudential Conſtitution, wherein St *Hierom* doth not only contradict the Joynt Suffrage of all the Ancients, but his own Teſtimony. Againſt this Opinion of St. *Hierom* ſome affirm, that what he ſaid was in a Diſcourſe againſt ſome proud Deacons, that would equal themſelves with the Presbyters, which was as great a preſumption as to invade the Office of the Biſhops, ſeeing in moſt things (as St. *Hierom* ſays) the Biſhops and Presbyters were of the ſame Power; for, *Quis patiatur,* ſaith St. *Hierom, &c.* Who can endure that they whoſe Office it was to attend on Tables and Widows, ſhould equal themſelves to thoſe, at whoſe Prayers the Body and Blood of Chriſt is conſecrated. But to let this paſs, I ſay, 2. This Opinion of his reflects on our Saviour and his Apoſtles, as if they had not ſufficiently provided for the future Peace of the Church; and that if the Presbyters in after-Ages had not been more provident, the Church would have wanted a Remedy againſt Schiſms: And if ſuch a Remedy were thought neceſſary by the whole World, (of Presbyters) then is the Office of a Biſhop founded on Natural Reaſon, for it is moſt true that the Peace of the Church (which conſiſts of a great number of the Clergy, which are as ſubject to Paſſions as other Men) cannot be ſecured in St. *Hierom*'s Opinion, without a Superior Power over them: *Cui ſi non exors & ab omnibus eminens detur poteſtas tot in Eccleſiis efficientur Schiſmata quot Sacerdotes:* To which, if all the reſt of the Clergy do not yield Obedience, there may be as many Schiſms in the Church as there are Prieſts. And thus it would follow, that neither Chriſt nor his Apoſtles did provide ſo well for the Churches Peace, as common Prudence, and Natural Reaſon would direct.

3. It

3. It being granted there was a Superiority in the Apoſtles, it is alledged, That after their Deaths, the Government, for a long time, fell to the ſeveral Presbyters, until the inconveniency of it appeared by the increaſe of Schiſms; and then it was agreed, *Toto orbe*, through the whole World, to advance one Presbyter with Power over the reſt. But when the Succeſſion of Biſhops is apparently recorded in moſt of the eminent Churches, immediately after the deceaſe of the Apoſtles, it is an incredible ſtory to tell us, that the Power of Governing the Church was in the Body of the Presbyters, of which there is not the leaſt Teſtimony in Antiquity for any one Church, nor any for the Time, Place, or Perſons, when this *Toto orbe decretum*, this new alteration ſhould be made; nor is it probable that all the World would agree at once to make an alteration in Church-Government; ſo that the reſult is this: There was a Superiority in the Apoſtles days, which ceaſed for a while, and then the Presbyters raiſed in common; but that Rule or Government was found to be the occaſion of many Schiſms, and then the Apoſtolical Superiority was decreed by all to be Re-eſtabliſhed. 4. St. *Hierom*'s words do not conſiſt with themſelves; for when he ſays theſe Presbyters did exalt one choſen from among themſelves, to a higher degree, whom they named a Biſhop, how can that conſiſt with what immediately follows: That a Presbyter had not the Power of Ordaining. *Quid enim facit exceptâ Ordinatione Epiſcopus quod non faciat Presbiter:* It ſeems by this the ancient Presbyters did firſt for neceſſary Cauſes, firſt ſet up Biſhops, and then it will ſound ill if our new Presbyters ſhould put them down, unneceſſarily. So that the moſt of what hath been alledged from the Divines of the Church of *England* in favour of Mr. *J. H*'s New Model, depending on the Teſtimony of St. *Hierom*, and that being proved to be a ſingle and ſlender Opinion, contrary to the Practice of all Churches, and not conſiſtent with itſelf: I ſuppoſe the Reader will not be of Mr. *H*'s mind, to deſtroy the eſtabliſhed Conſtitution, for a new, dangerous, and impracticable Invention, which indeed was no elder then *Socinus*, the firſt Inventer of Independent Churches, granting to every Congregation a Power to Elect their Church-Officers for Governing their Affairs, and deciding of Controverſies. And by this Deſign I perceive Mr. *J. H.* is of the ſame Judgment with Dr. *Owen*, as well in Church-Diſcipline, as in Doctrine, whoſe Treatiſe of *The In-dwelling of the Spirit*, and *Praying by the Spirit*, (not without a Contempt of our Lord's Prayer) Mr. *J. H.* in his peaceable Diſquiſitions and Animadverſions on a Diſcourſe writ againſt Dr. *Owen*'s book of the *Holy Spirit*, he attempts to reconcile to the Truth, as now he doth the Independent Principles and Practices with the Church of *England*.

F I N I S.

ERRATA.

PAge 3. line 2. after the word *Controverſie*, add *the Leſs is bleſſed of the Greater*. P. 4. l. 35. for *of* read *or*.